

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WILL any of those who are in need of consolation at the present time go for it to Mr. L. Cope CORNFORD'S book *The Secret of Consolation* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net)? It is most unlikely. If they go, will they find the consolation they are in need of? It is nearly certain that they will not. And yet the consolation is there. It is there, and it is the best consolation that book or man can offer.

But before the consolation comes, before one word is said about consolation, a hundred and twelve pages have to be read. And very few who seek consolation will read them. They are well written. They are written with a literary artist's practised pen. But they do not contain any consolation. They do not offer even the prospect of it.

They contain other things that are interesting. There is, for example, this appreciation of the British Government: 'A group of politicians known to be corrupt, unprincipled, and treacherous. . . . These men are morally drenched in blood from head to foot. Creatures of the mob they flattered and deluded, they are not more guilty than the people who made them; nor little more to blame than the men, their partners in the great political imposture, who were ostensibly their opponents, who let all go, and who finally, to

complete their betrayal, joined them in order to prolong their lease of usurpation. These be your gods, O Israel.'

That is interesting. But there is no consolation in it, nor the promise of consolation. Then Mr. CORNFORD enters the hospital where the wounded men are lying. The atmosphere changes. We cannot believe any longer that the book is written for the mere joy of writing, or even to denounce the Government. For this is what we read:

'Among the wounded men in the long ward, whose air is tainted with the stagnant hospital smell, one sits propped up with pillows, wearing a monstrous cap of bandages, which shadow his bright, wild eyes. He is perfectly still. Suddenly he speaks in a high monotone. "Oh—oh—oh, the dreadful pain, the dreadful pain; wait a minute, the dreadful pain, I must go home—the pain." His voice rises. The soldiers about him look at him. "Shot through the top of the head, poor chap," says one. "Bullet came out through his forehead. He gets these sudden pains, like, but they're soon over." The nurse came quietly to the wounded man's bedside, and gave him morphia. His voice dropped to an unintelligible mutter, and he was silent. Then he said loudly, "I'm going home." The men about laughed, "Ay, ay," said one soothingly, "you're going home all right, mate."

The secret of consolation is not revealed immediately. But now it is sure to come. And when it comes at last, what is it? It is just the old story over again, the story made so familiar to us by all our evangelical hymnology.

There is a blessed home
Beyond this land of woe,
Where trials never come,
Nor tears of sorrow flow.

This from Mr. CORNFORD may be unexpected. But he is quite emphatic in asserting it. 'The truth is,' he says, 'that the most important question in the world is whether or not there is a future life.' Why is it so important? Because in the certainty of a future life lies all the secret of consolation. Just one thing, therefore, is necessary in order to the making of a comforter. It is the ability to prove that there is a life to come.

But is not that just the one thing which nobody can prove? Mr. CORNFORD does not believe it. He believes that he can prove it himself.

For in the first place he holds that we are entitled to *assume* that there is a future life. The desire for it, you may say the expectation of it, is the gift of God. God's very character, therefore, is bound up with the fulfilment of the desire. That is why Christ says: 'If it were not so, I would have told you.' He took the place of God as He said it. He knew that God had given us the expectation. He pledged Himself for the faithfulness of God. And not in word only. In deed also. In life and in death. He lived in hourly communion with the life beyond. He died to bring us into that communion. And He rose again from the dead to return to the Father from whom He had come, the Firstfruits of them that slept.

Thus the assumption of a future life is the certainty of it. And we need no further proof. But Mr. CORNFORD is well aware that that assumption can be made only by those who first of all

have their hope in God. For the rest he has other arguments, but it must be confessed that they do not come to much. He argues that the soul is separable from the body, relying upon the philosophy of Dr. Theodore Merz for the force of it. Not only is the soul separable from the body, but, says Dr. Merz, it belongs to a different sphere of existence. It does not follow, therefore, that when the body dissolves, the soul will perish with it. It follows rather that it will enter upon some other independent life.

He argues also that if those who do not believe in God could only believe in themselves they might obtain the assurance of a life to come. For faith has the power of creating its own desires. This is an argument for which he has gone to Dr. Schofield and Mr. Troward and other popular psychologists. It has not been well developed yet. But one thing is clear. A faith which cannot find hope in God or salvation in Christ is not likely to be able to create any good thing.

And yet Mr. CORNFORD refuses to confine his consolation to those who have hope in God. For he sees that often enough the certainty of a life to come will be but a poor consolation even to them. The consolation of a life to come lies in the prospect of reunion. But where is the prospect of reunion if those who have been taken have not had *their* hope in God?

Let us approach the matter in this way. It is Mr. CORNFORD who tells the story. 'A parson of the Church of England and his friend, gliding swiftly in a motor-car across the dreaming English landscape in high summer, ran into a little town, where were strolling groups of soldiers.

"It is now said," the clergyman meditatively observed, "that when a soldier is killed in action, he goes to heaven, whatever his sins may have been. I cannot believe it. Supposing he has seduced a girl and left her—is he to escape punishment, because he is suddenly killed in the service of his country?"

"What *do* you believe, then?" asked his friend.

"'Pon my word," returned the parson honestly, "I don't know. But I find no warrant for the belief that plenary absolution accompanies the sacrifice of a man's life."'

Then if the sacrifice of a man's life does not obtain that 'plenary absolution' which would entitle his surviving friends to look forward to a joyful reunion, is there anything else that will do it? Mr. CORNFORD quotes another 'parson of the Church of England.' This parson believes that membership in the Church will do it. Has the stricken soldier been baptized? Has he been a partaker in the Holy Communion? That will do it. This parson is a sailor-parson. He employs nautical language.

'The way I put the matter,' he says, 'is this. I say that the world is a big ship, leaky and unseaworthy, and the Church is the lifeboat which comes alongside to take off the crew and passengers. They can come or not as they choose. But if they do choose, they get into the boat as they are told; they must sit quiet and obey orders, or be beaten over the head with a stretcher. There's enough to do to navigate the boat, without answering questions. The lifeboat will make harbour all right—no doubt about that. Time enough to answer questions when we're safe ashore. And,' added this bold ecclesiastic, 'you can call the coming aboard the boat Holy Baptism if you like, and the rations served out, Holy Communion; for these, I reckon, are the two essential Sacraments.'

Does that way of it satisfy Mr. CORNFORD? Not altogether. It is racy; but it is irreligious. For it takes away a man's responsibility. And without responsibility there can be no religious life. If the gifts and calling of God are without repentance, as we are told, then certainly God does not take back the gift of responsibility, and the call to be a man. If the sacrifice of a man's life in the performance of his duty does not entitle

him to absolution, much less can we look to membership in the Church for it.

Mr. CORNFORD looks elsewhere for the consolation. And he finds it. He finds it in faith. For faith is not the acceptance of a certain set of beliefs, to be laboriously learned from the creeds and the catechisms. It is the throwing open of one's life to the entrance of the energy of God. And the life may be thrown open in a moment. Then, though the sacrifice is not the cause of the absolution, it may very well be its occasion and evidence. And that is one side of it.

The other side is with the survivor. For faith in the survivor being again the opening of the life to the entrance of the energy of God, the prayer of faith has power with God Himself and prevails. It is able to create the very situation which it longs for. It longs for reunion with one who was taken suddenly as he went forward in the service of his country and counted not his life dear unto himself. God's answer is, 'O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

One problem for after-war settlement, and a difficult one, is Palestine. Among the few things that are clear about it is that the expectations of the Jews cannot be left out of account. It is quite true that the opinion is freely expressed that the Jews need not be taken into account, because they do not want to be taken into account. But that is a mistake. It is quite true again that the opinion is widely held that the Jews had better not be taken into account, because they would only exploit Palestine in the interests of a degrading commercialism. But that also is a mistake, and a greater one.

A volume has been published by Mr. John Murray on *Zionism and the Jewish Future* (2s. 6d. net). The volume, which is edited by Mr. H. SACHER, contains a number of essays on different subjects contributed by a number of authors of

different ways of thinking. But all the subjects turn upon the reoccupation of Palestine by the Jews, and all the authors agree that the Jews desire its reoccupation. One of the authors is Mr. Norman BENTWICH, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's Inn, and Inspector of the Egyptian Native Tribunals. His subject is 'The Future of Palestine.'

Now we are not to be understood as saying that the Jews are unconscious of the commercial possibilities of Palestine. Mr. BENTWICH begins there. 'Palestine,' he says, 'is essentially the land of religious influence and spiritual association,' and he will come to that. But first of all it is a land flowing with milk and honey—if only the Turks could be told to let it flow. And so he begins by showing what the possibilities are to the ancient nation of Israel, or such portion of it as to-day truly desires to make the Land of Promise a land of Reality.

And, first, its means of communication. 'The railway has taken the place of the road as the great means of communication between countries, but it follows the lines of the road; and it is along the Vale of Esdraelon and the maritime plain, where thousands of years ago the armies and caravans of Africa met the armies and caravans of Asia, that to-day the railroad linking India to Egypt must pass.' So the railway from Haifa to Damascus must be carried forward (it is a British undertaking) to the Euphrates and on to the Persian Gulf. The Euphrates portion is being pushed on despite the war; the rest must be completed after. When it is completed the near East and the far East will be linked up, and the whole of the Orient thrown open to the trade and prosperity of Europe. Already the Hedjaz line runs from Damascus southward, 'through the Hauran and the eastern side of Palestine, to Arabia Petraea and Arabia Felix, and opens up to economic and commercial enterprise a vast district, once one of the world's granaries, but for centuries abandoned to the marauding Bedouin.'

But agriculture is to-day, as it was 'in Bible times,' the main pursuit of the inhabitants of Palestine, the only considerable manufacture being that of soap from the olive-berry. And the Jews who go to settle in Palestine will go to cultivate the land. What is the prospect? Under the rule of the Turks the prospect is hopeless. But not because the land will not cultivate. The experience of the small German colonies which were planted some fifty years ago near Jaffa and Haifa, and of the Jewish colonies which have been scattered over the plains of Judæa and Samaria and the uplands of Galilee, has proved that the ancient fertility of the country may be restored by an industrious population.

And when the railways are in free working order agriculture will be assisted by trade. For 'mineral deposits exist in Palestine that promise industrial expansion. Phosphates are already mined on the east of the Jordan; the Dead Sea is known to be an untapped store of chemical wealth, which only awaits capital and a prudent administration to transform it into a kind of gold mine; oil has been struck in the same region; and it is said that the arid country to the south of Palestine contains workable veins of coal.'

One of the most familiar and far-seeing of the descriptions of Palestine is that it is 'a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.' It is a far-seeing description. It has taken all these centuries and this war to accomplish its fulfilment. But it will be fulfilled now. And then, 'with minerals to work factories, and an industrious labour force to man them, Palestine will have its manufacturing towns, and surely, but not, it may be hoped, too rapidly, it will become one of the commercial centres of the Near East.'

Be not alarmed. 'Palestine is not rich enough to attract those who are looking mainly for material advancement, but it is not too poor to provide for those emigrants who are willing to work for an

ideal. The mining of phosphates, moreover, will facilitate the intensive cultivation for which the Plain of Sharon and the Jordan Valley are adapted and the Jewish agriculturists, with their intellectual equipment, are peculiarly suited. Afforestation and terracing will restore the fertility and beauty of the hills and mountain-slopes. That in turn implies the need of a diligent and devoted peasantry, loving the land. But this condition should not be wanting, seeing that under the present unfavourable circumstances such a peasantry has been steadily increasing.'

But is there room for a large introduction of Jews into Palestine? There is plenty of room; even if by 'Palestine' we mean historical Palestine, that is to say, the territory between Dan and Beersheba and between the desert and the sea. Although it is a country only the size of Wales, embracing some 10,000 square miles, 6000 to the west of Jordan and 4000 to the east, yet Colonel Conder calculated that at one time it supported at least 10,000,000 persons, and that it could *immediately* maintain three or four times its present number of inhabitants. 'The density of population is now only seventy, and, excluding the towns, less than twenty-five per square mile. Even without the foundation of industries, by the good organization of agriculture it might be trebled and quadrupled. During the last century the population of Egypt has increased fourfold, while the country has remained almost wholly agricultural.'

Nor need Palestine to-day, says Mr. BENTWICH, be confined to its historic borders. 'When the Israelites were about to march from the Wilderness, they received at Horeb the message: "Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount. Turn you, and take your journey, and go to the mount of the Amorites, and unto all the places nigh thereto, in the plain, in the hills, and in the vale, and in the south, and by the seaside, to the land of the Canaanites, and to Lebanon, and unto the great river, the river Euphrates." From the Mediterranean to the

Euphrates, and from Lebanon to the river of Egypt—this is the territory which was to be the land of Israel, and in the future might be the Jewish land. All this area, this Greater Palestine, cries for a population to redeem it from the neglect and decay of centuries, and all of it is full of associations for the Jews. When Palestine was shut against them by the tyranny of Christianized Rome, they made a new Land of Israel in the country to the east; and when in recent times the door to Palestine seemed to be closed, Herzl looked to the El-Arish district as a starting-place of Jewish colonization on a large scale. The plateaux of Gilead and Moab and the plains that stretch away to the Tigris and Euphrates may be reclaimed by Jewish enterprise and industry no less than the stony hills of Judæa and Samaria and the green slopes of Galilee. Zionism, indeed, does not aim at leading back the whole of the Jewish people—the larger part will remain dispersed among the nations—but Greater Palestine may be a home for a very large remnant, numbered not in thousands, nor even in hundreds of thousands, but in millions.'

Does Mr. BENTWICH mean to say that Palestine is henceforth to be wholly Jewish? No, nor does he desire that. There is a Christian population in Palestine now, and he does not dream of dispossessing it. But the yearning of the Christians is rather for the control of particular sites than for settlement on the land. More to be taken account of are the Syrians and Arabs. The Syrians in the north have begun to cast covetous eyes on the sparsely populated tracts around them, and may set off the claim of neighbourhood against the claim of ancient title. But they are likely, Mr. BENTWICH thinks, 'to find a greater attraction in the rich valleys of Anatolia, when that province is opened up, than in the mountainous country to the south.' The Arabs of Palestine already number more than half a million, and the territory adjoining is the home of wandering tribes of Bedouin. But 'there is ample room for the children of Esau and of Jacob to live together in harmony on the land.'

'It is the Jews alone who will make any large and systematic immigration into Palestine, and it is Jewish enterprise and enthusiasm and devotion which will have to restore it to its former proud place in the annals of civilization. They will bring a higher standard of life from which the Arabs will gain, and they will require the Arabs' help in reclaiming the waste places. The interests of the present and the future population in fact coincide, and it should be within the powers of a just administration to secure a good understanding and co-operation between the two elements that are in origin akin and stand in material need of each other.'

The problem of the Person of Christ is settled for us when we settle the question of His sinlessness. It is settled for us practically. For however many and however hard may be the difficulties that remain, they are all theological or philosophical—difficulties of the mind only, not of the heart or will, not of love or loyalty. They who deny His sinlessness deny, and they know that they are denying, His Godhead, and all that historical Christianity has stood for.

Now the chief difficulty in accepting Christ's sinlessness is the Temptation in the Wilderness. It is not the difficulty that the unbeliever relies upon. He relies upon the cursing of the fig-tree, the overturning of the money-changers' tables, the challenge to the Ruler, 'Why callest thou me good?' The unbeliever who wishes to propagate his unbelief relies upon these because they have a popular appeal. But the unbeliever and the believer together know very well that the Temptation is the real difficulty. They do not worry over the difference between *non posse peccare* and *posse non peccare*. They simply say that a Being who was so constituted that He never sinned was never really tempted to sin.

The Rev. Stephen LIBERTY, sometime Subwarden of St. Deiniol's Library, is not an unbeliever. He has little sympathy with the small

bird-pecks by which Christ is represented as having been less than sinless. But he sees the difficulty that lies in the Temptation. He believes that Jesus was never tempted.

The book in which this startling statement is made is called *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (Oxford University Press; 3s. 6d. net). It is occupied—a good occupation for the present time—with the national aspects of the Life of Jesus. It asserts that the Temptation in the Wilderness had no personal reference whatever to Jesus, but is to be taken entirely in a national aspect.

As a literal historical event the Temptation never happened. Mr. LIBERTY does not think it necessary now to argue that. 'No one to-day,' he says, 'would think of limiting its significance to the literal statements, or require that, even as an acted parable, Jesus must necessarily have been tempted to demand the transformation of stones into bread, or have really taken His stand on the roof of the Temple, or seen all the kingdoms of the world from a high mountain. Such an interpretation would have been as foreign to the Oriental thought of the first hearers as to the historical and scientific sense of the present day.'

That does not mean that the narrative is the product of some one's consummately clever imagination. Jesus Himself told the story of the Temptation. Mr. LIBERTY has no doubt about that. But whether He actually experienced it in a vision, or merely related it in the form of a parable, just as He related the experiences of Dives and Lazarus, he does not know, and he is not greatly concerned to know. Certainly if it was a vision it was a personal experience. But that does not alter the argument. If Jesus had a vision of that which we know as the Temptation in the Wilderness, He had it not for His own sake, not at all for His own sake, but wholly and solely for the sake of the nation. That is Mr. LIBERTY's belief.

For to have had it for His own sake is not only to introduce all the difficulty into His sinlessness, it is to make so very little of Himself. Was He urged to use His Messianic powers in order to relieve His own hunger? Mr. LIBERTY says we have only to know Him to see how wide of the mark such a 'temptation' would have been. Was He invited to throw Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple in order to impress the people with His uniqueness? No doubt He was, and knew that He was, unique and altogether unapproachable. But the uniqueness that consists in working wonders He ever did His utmost to keep out of the people's sight. Was He shown all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time and then told that they would be His without cross or conflict if only He would fall down and worship Satan? Mr. LIBERTY is not sure if Satan was there at all; but if he was, he is sure that he knew better than make such an offer with such a condition.

The Temptation was not for Him, but for the nation. If He represented it as His own, that was only because He was the nation's representative. There were three parties in the nation—Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians. The Sadducees were known for their love of ease, the Pharisees for their arrogance towards God, the Herodians for their readiness to compromise with the heathen world. These three parties with their characteristics gave Jesus the framework for the narrative of the Temptation, as well as the occasion for relating it.

First of all, the Sadducees were content with the mere continuance of the Jewish State as a State. They would have preferred to have it in their own hands. But they knew that, at present at anyrate, that could not be. So they were content to wait. Meantime they had a considerable share of 'peace' and wealth. And as long as they had that, why should they do anything to disturb relations which might easily be made worse? They had not the outward show of

statecraft, but they had many of its substantial advantages.

Thus the Sadducees were faithless to the promises of God. They were as unappreciative of the greatness of their high calling as the Israelites had been in the Wilderness. The promise had been of a land flowing with milk and honey. The Israelites took it literally. And they were content to let even the future literality go, if only they had their leeks and onions and garlicks now.

Jesus told the story of the First Temptation. The reference to the Wilderness journey is unmistakable. Just as the Israelites were content with the immediate satisfaction of their bodily cravings, so were the Sadducees content with the material advantages of the Theocracy. The answer of Jesus to Satan recalls them to their duty. 'Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' They knew what was meant by 'every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' The phrase was taken from Deuteronomy. It refers to Divine promises, not to Divine commands. As the Psalmist says, 'My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips' (Ps 89³⁴). 'How could He,' asks Mr. LIBERTY indignantly, 'viewing Himself as a solitary Messiah, be in danger of ignoring any of the promises of God?' No, but 'it was just their total indifference to the spiritual side of the nation's inheritance and to the promise of world-wide influence, which explained all the other unlovely characteristics of the Jerusalem leaders, their rationalism, their heathenish luxury, their political opportunism, and their deceitful attitude towards the Roman power.

The outlook of the Pharisees was very different from that of the Sadducees. Having the emoluments of office, the Sadducees were fairly well content. The Pharisees had the worship of the people, but only degenerate members of their order were content with it. They had a clearly

defined programme for the nation. God had promised them their land in absolute independence of the Gentile. And to its independent enjoyment He had attached the simple condition that the Law should be obeyed. Their whole purpose therefore was to obey the Law, and then put God to the test. Let us keep the Law, and see whether or not He will free us from the yoke of Rome.

Jesus came as the Messiah. Of course He would be a Pharisee and keep the Law. But that was not enough. As the Representative of the nation He must take the lead in freeing the land. It is well that He should give proof of His ability to lead. Let Him put God to the test by some preliminary and public act. Let Him throw Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple. The promise is unmistakable. 'He shall give his angels charge over thee.' If it fails the failure is Jesus' own; but if it succeeds they may go forward confidently under His leadership to deliverance.

Jesus refused the test. Why? Just because it was a test. There lay the whole Pharisaic blunder. They were doing over again that which their fathers had done in the Wilderness. 'And he called the name of the place Massah (Tempting), and Meribah (Strife), because of the striving of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord, saying, Is the Lord among us, or not?' That was not the only time they 'tempted' God in the Wilderness. Of a later occasion the Psalmist says: 'They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust. Yea, they spake against God; they said, Can God prepare a table in the wilderness? Behold, he smote the rock, that waters gushed out, and streams overflowed; can he give bread also? Will he provide flesh for his people?'

What right had the Israelites to 'tempt' God? They had no right. It was presumption. It implied a superiority on their part, either of insight or of goodwill. God alone knows when to intervene and how. When at last the Pharisees resolved

to 'tempt' God to the uttermost, and entered upon that awful event which we call the Jewish War, they did so, says Professor Margoliouth, in a reckless and desperate experiment to settle for ever the question whether the Jehovah of whom they boasted was or was not on a par with the Bels and Nebos ridiculed by their prophets as unable to defend their worshippers or their shrines, and carried into captivity with the nations who served them.

The answer of Jesus was, 'It is written, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.' In that answer the whole idea was condemned which gave the Pharisees a reason for their existence.

Following the order in St. Matthew, Mr. LIBERTY takes the temptation on the high mountain last. It seems to him also to be the subtlest. For what did the Herodians stand for? Was it not alliance with Rome, and was not alliance with Rome equivalent to universal dominion? The Sadducees and the Pharisees were too provincial. They would be content if Israel were in undisputed possession of the land of Israel. But surely the promise, the promise even to Abraham, was that 'in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'

Jesus is taken up into a high mountain and shown all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. Well, they are to be His. That is the promise, even though the Pharisees and the Sadducees are denying it. 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Is 49⁶). Come, said the Herodian Satan, fulfil the prophecy.

Did he know how ardently the soul of Jesus longed for its fulfilment? He did not know. But he guessed somewhat. Yet Jesus did not hesitate. The kingdoms are His, and He will have them. But not in that way. 'Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou

shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'

It was only a matter of method. The devil offered them without the Cross, did he? There was small temptation in that. Was Jesus likely to go back on the very purpose for which He had come into the world? The temptation lay, not in any personal consideration, but in consideration for the people of Israel.

For the Gentiles are not to be brought to God by a compromise between Jewish and Gentile ideas of God, such as the Herodians were working for.

That is not to fulfil the promises, but to reduce them to ridicule. From first to last the promises were that the Gentiles should *come to Zion*. The last of all the prophets was in the direct succession when he spoke of the City of God and said, 'The nations shall walk amidst the light thereof; and the Kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.'

The Herodians with their homage to all kinds of Gods and cultures were more dangerous than the Pharisees or the Sadducees. And to them the sternest word was spoken, 'Get thee hence, Satan.' For there is only one living and true God, and it is written, 'Him *only* shalt thou serve.'

The Preaching of Justice.

BY THE REV. J. M. E. ROSS, M.A., GOLDERS GREEN, LONDON.

'Justice, justice.'—Dt 16²⁰ (R.V. Marg.).

CIRCUMSTANCES do not alter Truth, but occasionally they alter the perspective in which we see it or the emphasis with which we state it. And while war-time has not cancelled any of the New Testament doctrines or duties, it has certainly thrown up into stronger relief some of the great discoveries of Old Testament experience. Some of us are not ashamed to confess the help the Old Testament has been to us during these last difficult months, when the strain on faith has been so heavy. The New Testament was produced, its fundamental facts came into history, in the era of the Roman peace. We have no clear indication of how the Apostles and their immediate followers would have behaved in a time of world-warfare,—of how the Great Exemplar Himself would have led in such a time; we are left with general principles of personal meekness on the one hand, of loyalty to the State on the other, which are differently interpreted by different men equally devout and sincere. This has led lately to a wistful re-examination of the Old Testament on the part of many—conscious that they must ever correct its tempers by the Christian ideals, yet thankful for prophets and psalmists, historians and law-givers who had to confront world-shaking experiences akin to our own. If the charge is brought against us that we

are meantime living in the Old Testament when we ought to be living in the New, we answer that at least a few discoveries were made in the Old Testament times which our Lord did not cancel and which nothing discovered since has ever annulled. One of these is that the Lord is a God of justice, and that righteousness and judgment are the foundation of His throne. That note—not entirely forgotten, perhaps, but scarcely emphasized since younger days when we first discovered the prophets and came under the spell of Thomas Carlyle—has been forced back into our preaching by the time. This doctrine, after being for a period an accepted commonplace, has become a passionate necessity: in such an hour there is no other resting-place.

The repetition here—*Justice, justice!*—almost suggests a momentary wave of emotion breaking over the lawgiver's soul. Men of law are not usually given to emotion; they do not dip their pens in flame; if they allowed passion to sway them, they could not do their work with the rigid, undeviating exactness which it requires. So for the most part the lawgivers of the Old Testament leave emotion to the prophets; they themselves go about their cold work in their cold way. Here, however, it looks as though, even in a mere passage of rule and regulation, the writer's pen trembled

for a moment in his hand under the pressure of an ideal passionately desired. 'Justice, justice,' he writes, as if heart and pen were for the moment enthralled by the word that was more than a mere commandment—a vision descending out of heaven from God, a deep and tremendous necessity for man if he would make his life in this world safe and prosperous.

Here we touch one of the most fundamental instincts of our human nature. It is often visible in the life of a child, the sense of fair-play, the tearful perplexity occasioned by some small injustice in home or school, the passionate resentment when a youthful martyr has been unjustly punished. And it emerged with great vividness also in the thought of humanity, in days when the world was a good deal nearer to its childhood than it now is. When the thought of Greece was at its best, the idea of justice and the idea of God were almost interchangeable.¹ Justice was the daughter of Zeus. Aeschylus was the poet of justice,—of a power from whose pursuit, whether for reward or for punishment, no human soul could escape. 'Justice hath not suffered him to live' was the thought of the Maltese barbarians regarding Paul, put into words by a Hellenic mind. And in the Old Testament the same thought is central: the momentary passion of this law-giver's reference is but the electric spark which tells of a powerful current: the ideal of justice gripped the Hebrew conscience with a force which can still be felt. Principal Harper, writing of these very Deuteronomic codes, admirably summarizes the Hebrew conception as comprising three elements—first, that justice should be cheap; second, that it should be accessible; and third, that it should be impartial,—the phrase in v.¹⁹, 'Thou shalt not respect persons, nor take a gift,' is characteristic. No doubt the doctrine of impartiality took grim forms. But even the *lex talionis* was meant to be impartial; it could be invoked by the poor against the rich as much as by the rich against the poor. It was the doctrine of human brotherhood in a sour and unripe stage of development. It was the idea of equality encased in a hard shell. And because the men who proclaimed this doctrine of justice were so sure that the Power reigning in the highest was a power making for righteousness, they were not ashamed to claim divine sanction for

it and to utter it with a 'Thus saith the Lord.' Justice was to them more than the secret of a stable society: it was the will and commandment of the Almighty.

This primal instinct of the human conscience has risen again to the surface with extraordinary force: since the devastation of Belgium and some other things that have happened, multitudes have come to feel, more or less articulately, that in the last analysis this is the thing that matters most, and that there is no secure basis for the kingdom of love or for the peaceful progress of civilization except as justice reigns among men. Here is an appeal to which at the present time men are unusually sensitive, a cause for which many of the best are giving their all. Is it not possible for the Christian preacher to make good use of this, holding this thought in his hand like a lamp and turning the light of it in various directions—say, towards theology, towards society, and towards eschatology?

1. There is a theological message here,—something that bears witness to God. We need it all the more because our minds work in the opposite direction to those of Jewish lawgivers and prophets. They believed in God, in a God with a character, and therefore they believed in justice as the expression of His will. There are many among us who, if they move upon a theological track at all, must move the other way, and here is a thought by which perhaps they may be helped to climb to Him. Here is a holy and accepted message—a message so accepted that it moves armies and fleets and calls men from their homes and their dearest possessions. Whence did this idea come? Must not this flame in human hearts have been lit at a fire greater than itself? If the souls of men have a sense of justice, then must we not accept Carlyle's doctrine that 'the great soul of the world is just'? No blind-force theory of the universe is adequate to account for the sense of justice in human hearts, any more than it is adequate to account for the instinct of pity and love. Flame comes from flame. Writing can come only from a hand that writes. And if this word 'Justice' is written times without number upon the page of history, and freshly now upon the heart of civilization, we may take it as the signature of Him whose name is Holy.

2. There is also a social message here, for if it is only upon the bed-rock of justice that international relations can be made stable, it is only on the same basis that the social fabric within our own

¹ Cf. Adam, *The Religious Teachers of Greece*, p. 145; Ramsay, *Luke the Physician*, p. 11.

borders can be secure. We are catching a glimpse just now of that on which all things rest, without which all things shake and rock. And though, in the war, we are absorbed in one special application of the message, there are other applications that will not wait long after the war is over before they clamour for attention. This was beginning to be apparent even before the war began. People were getting tired of charity. They were, indeed, beginning to be afraid of charity. They had come to realize that mere charity, as a remedy for human sorrow and need, had been rather a ghastly failure. They were wondering whether it was not time to try a little justice in its place. Large gifts to church or charity from those who did not treat their own employees fairly were beginning to look specially odious. And there was a deep and widespread feeling among social workers of all types that the whole system we had allowed to grow up was tremendously and tragically unfair. The war has meantime interrupted the efforts that might have been made to reach a better state of things. But the interruption has been only temporary, and we must be prepared for the hour when many who have been fighting for international justice away from our shores will come back to raise the same banner in a more peaceful but no less urgent way among ourselves, and to tell us that a civilization which is worth risking one's life for must be made habitable for those who survive.

When Jeremy Taylor wrote of Christian Justice in the *Holy Living*, it was characteristic of his age and standpoint that he should treat first of 'Obedience to our Superiors.' When we think of social justice to-day, we most readily turn to the other side of the matter—the duties of those who are in possession to those who are more or less disinherited. But the complete ideal includes both sides: it includes the loyalty of conscience to the smallest and humblest task; it includes also a scrupulous care on the part of those who hold the greater posts and privileges that those whose lives they control shall not be robbed of anything essential to a complete and healthy existence. Here is indeed a two-edged sword, which requires careful handling. 'For although the poor must fare no worse for his poverty, yet in justice he must fare no better for it; and although the rich must be no more regarded, yet he must not be less. And to this purpose the tutor of Cyrus instructed him, when in a controversy where a

great boy would have taken a large coat from a little boy, because his own was too little for him and the other's was too big, he adjudged the great coat to the great boy; his tutor answered, "Sir, if you were made a judge of decency or fitness, you had judged well in giving the biggest to the biggest; but when you are appointed judge, not whom the coat did fit but whose it was, you should have considered the title and the possession, who did the violence, and who made it, or who bought it." And so it must be in judgments between the rich and the poor: it is not to be considered what the poor man needs, but what is his own.'¹

3. The same light shines upon the Future. The same instinct of justice as so unsparingly condemns the present makes a better and fairer future inexorably necessary, if this universe is to be counted in any sense rational. Men's thoughts worked along that line long ago. It was one thing for prophets and lawgivers to preach justice; it was another for kings and common men to put those teachings into practice. And injustice built in Israel, as elsewhere, a dark and terrible kingdom. Kings were unjust to their people. People were unjust to one another. Commercialism had its slaves and victims, when the poor were sold for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes. And worst of all, the warrior empires of the world—ambitious, grasping, conscienceless—trod down the smaller peoples into bondage and death. So the instinct for justice, deprived of its rights in the present, turned to the future as to its kingdom. The day of justice was not yet: it was coming: it must come. This promised Day of the Lord was to be a day of stable equilibrium for human society, a day of just judgment upon the evil-doer and of just recompense to the man who feared God, a day when the wounds of the world should be closed by the Sun of Righteousness arisen with healing in His wings.

The logic of that ancient hope still holds. The more loudly the cry for justice calls from the human heart, the more it seems to call in vain to the god of things-as-they-are, who is very like 'the god of this world.' The greater the need, therefore, to guide this expectation towards the God of things-as-they-are-to-be, who is very like the God of the prophets and of the Christ. In short, the greater the need of an Advent hope. Men's thoughts of the final judgment, so far as they believe in it at

¹ *Holy Living*, iii. ii.

all, have been slowly changing. A century ago the supreme question relating to that day was—How shall man justify himself before God? Souls of our own day, believing and reverent, often show unconsciously but plainly that for them the centre of interest in eschatology has shifted: it is now the question—How shall God justify Himself before men? how shall He show that all along His administration of His universe has been wise and righteous? It is the preacher's task to show that here also, as in its social aspects, justice is a two-sided thing, and that if we are deeply right in expecting the Judge of all to satisfy our instinct for justice, this very demand on our part may recoil upon ourselves in condemnation if we have failed in righteous dealing towards God and man. If we emphasize the latter side, it is a warning to which the deepest things in nature and life give weight: it makes us tremble in our hope, and turn again from God's righteousness to the gospel of His mercy. But if we preach the former side, as we must sometimes do, it gives us an advent conception real, ethical, and permanent, so that we

can rejoice in our trembling and lift up our heads to look for new heavens and a new earth wherein righteousness shall dwell. Rousseau wrote once in bitter sarcasm to a wealthy and powerful man who had wronged him, 'You belong to a class which relieves you from the necessity of being just,' and human nature on many a flimsy pretext escapes too often from that necessity. Therefore when all is done that can be done along the line of effort and education, we look higher than human nature to bring in the desired consummation. God's day is coming. He Himself is coming, the Just and the Merciful. The souls that realize the meaning of this hope take from it for themselves and for humanity a humble confidence:

Fear not; He made thee dust:

Cling to that sweet word 'Just';

All's well with thee if thou art in Just Hands.

They also learn a grave responsibility,—as the Master said, not to beat their fellow-servants, not to eat and drink with the drunken, but to have lamps lit and loins girt and to be themselves like men who wait for their Lord.

The Denials of Peter.

BY SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., LITT.D., D.D., EDINBURGH.

IV. GENERAL FEATURES IN THE SCENE OF THE DENIALS.

It was into the courtyard of a house of this type that Jesus was led somewhere about 3.30 or 4 o'clock on that dark and bleak March morning. He was closely followed to the gate by Peter and John. The Synoptists, indeed, say that Peter followed 'at a distance' (*μακρόθεν*, Lk.; *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*, Mt., Mk.); but there is no real discrepancy between their statement and that of the Fourth Gospel, which says that John entered along with Jesus into the courtyard, and that Peter was standing outside the gate. Both disciples followed separately from one another,¹ and from the guards who were conducting Jesus; but,

although Peter was at a distance, he had to keep near enough to follow the company through the streets; and there occurred a halt somewhere, probably at the outer gate of the house of Annas, when the Roman soldiers handed over the prisoner to the custody of the Jewish leaders and marched away to their barracks in the castle Antonia. There were no Romans at the mock trial in the house of Annas, and no Romans at the legal trial before the official meeting of the High Council which began about sunrise, 6 A.M. This absence led the Synoptists to neglect also their presence at the arrest: in other words, that detail perished from the oral tradition of the early Church in Jerusalem, and only John added it in his Gospel.

During the delays thus caused, Peter came up, and was stopped at the gate by the doorkeeper. She had allowed John to pass because he was a known person in the household; but she stopped Peter, until John, perceiving that Peter had not entered, spoke to her, and induced her to admit

¹ That is suggested (though not proved absolutely) by the Synoptists' silence about John, and it is quite consistent with the expression of the Fourth Gospel; but John when still outside the gate perceived that Peter was there (as will be seen later).

Peter. As John had to go out of the courtyard in order to speak to the gatekeeper,¹ it is evident that the gate was not merely an opening with a door in the wall of the courtyard, but was something distinct and apart: in other words, there was a gateway with a passage and a door at the outer end of the passage, while the gatekeeper had her place in this passage, perhaps in a little porter's chamber. This passage, or whatever exactly it was, is called by Mark *προαύλιον*, and by Matthew (who used Mark) *πυλῶν*.

Jesus was led across the courtyard and up the entrance stairs of the dwelling-house into a large audience chamber, which was the public room, used for receptions and assemblies and in general for conference with visitors. This room looked down over the courtyard:² that is invariable in every Turkish house of this type, so far as I have seen; I have seen hundreds of them in many parts of Asia Minor and a few in Palestine. Annas took his seat at the inner end of the chamber, where he would have received an honoured guest. Jesus, still bound as the Romans had handed Him over to the Jews, stood at the opposite end towards the courtyard, facing towards Annas; but by turning round He could look out over what was being done there. Peter was beneath in the courtyard. John, we cannot doubt, went up to the audience chamber after introducing Peter into the house. His position as one known to the high priest would give him this privilege, but would not entitle a youth like him to a place at the inner end beside Annas. He stood at the outer end near Jesus and His guards.

After the third denial began the maltreatment described in Lk 22⁶³⁻⁶⁵, which went on until about 5.30 A.M. Then Jesus was led away to the High Council, which met at sunrise, about 6 o'clock or a little later.³

It is apparent to the careful reader of Luke that he was conscious of certain analogies between incidents in the life of Jesus and incidents in the

life of Paul. To those which have been mentioned by the present writer elsewhere, he would add the examination before the high priest. In both cases the accused made a statement which was considered by the Jews to be disrespectful to the high priest, and one of the servants in the room struck him. The analogy is not merely superficial, it has a deeper character, and of this, I think, Luke was fully conscious. In each case the high priest is placed in an unbecoming position. In the earlier case he was acting unjustly in so far as he was not officially a high priest, but was pretending to examine the accused before the formal meeting had begun. In the latter case, the high priest was taking his seat as an adviser in the Council as a Roman officer, he was not acting in the fashion that became the high priest of the Jews, but was making himself an instrument in the legal proceedings of a hated alien.

When one reads the two narratives in the Gospel of John and in the Acts, and when one compares Luke with John in respect of the real meaning of the two scenes and the deep analogy which lies between them, then the full consciousness of Luke that this analogy was a true and deep-seated one becomes evident.

Why does not Luke mention this part of the trial of Jesus, if he was conscious of the analogy? The answer touches a most important feature of this subject, that he trusted to general familiarity with the facts.

There are still one or two mistranslations which have affected the interpretation of this narrative in the minds of certain scholars. Dr. Moffatt, in his 'New Translation' of the New Testament, misrepresents the meaning of Jn 18²⁴, which he renders, 'Annas, therefore, had him bound, and sent him to Caiaphas.' The meaning of the three Greek words is 'Annas sent him bound as he was to Caiaphas.' The binding according to John had taken place when Jesus was arrested, and this statement we know to have been inevitably correct. Roman soldiers who arrested a prisoner always bound him, and John, the eye-witness of the scene, says that it was so. Matthew, on the other hand, says, that at the conclusion of the meeting of the Sanhedrim, probably about seven o'clock in the morning, 'they bound Jesus and led him away, and delivered him to Pilate the Governor.' I would here propose a speculation which I have not the knowledge to criticise or to verify; but if it is

¹ ἐξῆλθεν . . . καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ; A.V. and R.V. both use the term porch in Matthew and in Mark. It is implied, but not named, by John. Luke makes no reference to it.

² καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, Mk 14⁶⁶ (see above, at the beginning of Section III.).

³ We must regretfully abandon the current explanation that Jesus, when He looked at Peter, was being led away through the courtyard, for Luke describes Him as remaining in the house of Annas exposed to ill-treatment for some time after that.

correct, it shows one more quite remarkable agreement in detail between John and Matthew. How was a prisoner treated in the Jewish Council who was accused but not yet condemned? Was he left bound while He was under trial? According to Matthew, Jesus was not bound while he was being tried before the Council of the Jews. According to John, Jesus had been bound by the Roman soldiers, and remained bound all the time until He was brought into the presence of Caiaphas, the president of the Council. It would illustrate the higher moral standard on which the Jewish nation stood in comparison with the pagan races around, that the accused person should be released from his bonds while he was under trial.

On the other hand, the treatment of Paul, a Roman citizen, when he was examined before the Roman Governor Festus and the Jewish King Agrippa, forms a marked contrast to the theoretical interpretation of Jewish conduct which is suggested by the comparison of John with Matthew. This Roman whose case Festus had already inquired into and who had appealed to the supreme court of the Empire was, in accordance with Roman practice, kept bound as a prisoner from the time that he was first arrested; and in the palace where he was being tried by the highest officials of the province, he held out his hands in his impassioned appeal to Agrippa, and said, 'I would to God, that not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds.' The dramatic effect produced by the contrast between the freedom and power with which Paul addressed the assembly and the fetters which he displayed on his hands is remarkable. But although Festus immediately afterwards could say that 'this man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds,' Paul continued to wear the fetters to which every prisoner was condemned. The theory and practice of Roman procedure was that the guards in charge of any prisoner were responsible with their lives for his safe custody, and it was left to them to secure themselves by taking every precaution.

After drawing these inferences regarding the proceedings in the house of Annas, we begin to be conscious that John himself has said so plainly in v.²⁴. 'Annas therefore sent Jesus, bound

as he was, to Caiaphas.' Jesus¹ had never been unbound in Annas' house. He was there only the captive in charge of guards, who were responsible with their lives for His custody. He was not yet delivered up to any official; it was not until He was handed over to Caiaphas, the high priest and president of the Council, that the guards could consider their duty to be completed. Until he is condemned, the accused person remains unbound in the Jewish court. But in the house of Annas, where the guards stopped to wait for day and the assembling of the Council, Jesus continued to wear the fetters of custody.

Into this clear and important statement, Dr. Moffatt has introduced a mistranslation which distorts the evidence. In the other case above mentioned, he accepts the mistranslation of others; here he goes wrong, without (so far as I know) any predecessor, rendering, 'Annas, therefore, had him bound, and sent him to Caiaphas.' This misrepresents the Greek, implying that Jesus had been unbound in the house of Annas for examination, and was now rebound at Annas' order and sent on to Caiaphas. This translation is not possible within the limits of Greek grammar. With so many misunderstandings of the facts and the action, it is not wonderful that Dr. Moffatt makes a wholly unjustified transposition in the text of John in order to get some faint show of support from the Fourth Gospel for his misunderstanding of the Synoptists.

This vice of transposition in a work intended for the general public is worthy of strong condemnation. As a device in classical scholarship it has been much misused, and is now largely discredited. Where it is in some few cases permitted by common consent, as in Lucretius several times, the origin of the misplacement is explained by the fact that a whole page has got out of order; but Dr. Moffatt makes his transpositions in the New Testament, sometimes of shorter, sometimes of longer passages, without explanation justified by critical canons, solely on account of the difficulty in understanding the text. You can get rid of almost every difficulty, and also of all character and instructiveness and power, by freely transposing the text of any author and adding a few conjectural 'emendations.'

¹ ὁ δεδεμένος, the prisoner.

Literature.

EDWARD CARPENTER.

MR. EDWARD CARPENTER was born to seek the simple life. From the first dawning of intelligence he began to throw off conventionalities. And all his life, if he could not throw them off—for he had not always the courage of his convictions—he chafed and fumed under them, making life a burden to himself, and sometimes also to his friends.

Mr. Carpenter has written an autobiography. He calls the book *My Days and Dreams* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). It is easy reading, and it is likely to be read. But there is not much exhilaration in it. Mr. Carpenter sought the simple life and found it, but the feeling you have is that it was scarcely worth the finding. 'People have often asked me,' he says, 'if I did not miss the life I had left behind. I cannot truly say that I ever did. At Brighton and at Cambridge and partly in London I had had my fill of balls and dinner-parties and the usual entertainments, and when at the close of those two dispensations (somewhere in the early 'eighties) *I gave my dress clothes away*, I did so without any misgiving and without any fear that I should need them again. The fact is that though it is perfectly true that by steadily and persistently going to evening parties and social functions one may come into touch with interesting or remarkable people of sorts, yet the game is hardly worth the candle. Through leagues of boredom, platitudes, and general futility one occasionally has the satisfaction of exchanging a wink of recognition, so to speak, with some really congenial and original woman or man; but at all such functions the severe flow of amiable nonsense soon cuts any real conversation short, and if one wants to continue the latter the only way is to arrange a meeting quite outside and apart—which after all one might have done in other and simpler ways. As to the matter of dress, the adoption of a pleasant yet not strictly conventional evening garb of one's own has the useful effect of automatically closing doors which are not "worth while" and opening those that *are*—so in that way it is much to be recommended!'

Well, that is not heroic. Nor is it simplicity. The closing of doors is the unmistakable act of

an epicure. And it is just in that sense that Mr. Carpenter's story affects us. He had wealth enough to go and do as he pleased. He went and associated himself with hard-working people. But he did not work hard. He entered sympathetically into the tragedy of the city life some miles away from his country home. But he never suffered tragically. What is it that he has missed—he with his fine sensibilities, his generous deeds? Just one thing—religion. He was in Holy Orders once—where he had no business to be, for even then he was attending an agnostic club and listening to unprintable blasphemies—but he slipped that off also on his way to the simple life, and the simple life became to him neither tragedy nor comedy, but just so many closed doors and things that were 'not worth while.'

REST DAYS.

Mr. Hutton Webster, Ph.D., has written a great book on *Rest Days* (Macmillan Company; \$3). It is a great subject, and deserves a great book. There are few countries in the world and few customs in any country, into which it is impossible to run after the thought of a day of rest. Dr. Webster has pursued it everywhere.

The most striking fact brought out of the investigation is the widespread and powerful influence of the moon. 'There is good reason for believing that among many primitive peoples the moon, rather than the sun, the planets, or any of the constellations, first excited the imagination and aroused feelings of superstitious awe or of religious veneration.' Dr. Webster quotes from Albiruni's *India* the beliefs of a learned Muhammadan of the eleventh century:

'That the moon has certain effects on moist substances, that they are apparently subject to her influences, that, for instance, increase and decrease, in ebb and flow develop periodically and parallel with the moon's phases, all this is well known to the inhabitants of seashores and seafaring people. Likewise physicians are well aware that she affects the *humores* of sick people, and that the fever-days revolve parallel with the moon's course. Physical scholars know that the life of animals and plants depends upon the moon, and experimentalists

know that she influences marrow and brain, eggs and the sediments of wine in casks and jugs, that she excites the minds of people who sleep in full moonlight, and that she affects (?) linen clothes which are exposed to it. Peasants know how the moon acts upon fields of cucumbers, melons, cotton, etc., and even make the times for the various kinds of sowing, planting, and grafting, and for the covering of the cattle depend upon the course of the moon. Lastly, astronomers know that meteorologic occurrences depend upon the various phases through which the moon passes in her revolutions.'

Coming to the Hebrew Sabbath, Dr. Webster denies an Egyptian, Babylonian, or Canaanite origin. It is a Hebrew, that is to say an Arab, institution. 'The ancient dwellers in the Arabian wilderness, who celebrated new moon and full moon as seasons of abstinence and rest, little dreamed that in their senseless custom lay the roots of a social institution, which, on the whole, has contributed to human welfare in past ages and promises an even greater measure of benefit to humanity in all future times.'

This chapter is brimful of ideas for the student of the Old Testament.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL BIBLE.

We always knew that Psychology was coming, but we had no notion that it would come in this way. Mr. Elijah V. Brookshire has shown us 'the Scriptures in the Light of the Science of Psychology,' and has called his volume *The Law of Human Life* (Putnam; 10s. 6d. net). It is a handsome volume. For Mr. Brookshire has taken pains to show us what the Science of Psychology can make of all the great men of the Bible (except David), and of all the experiences which are related of them.

We said, 'all the great men except David.' But we see that only one of the prophets is psychologically explained. It is Jonah. Why Jonah alone? Because—let us quote—'The book of Jonah is the story of the prophet, and of every prophet. It is an allegory descriptive of the suffering, trials, and provocations which every human soul must experience which becomes a conscious organ of the Holy Spirit. Briefly speaking, it is an allegory descriptive of the evolution of the prophet, the servant of God.

"God revealeth His secret unto His servants the prophets" (Amos 3⁷).'

Let us go on: 'Jesus tells the Pharisees that no sign is to be given but the sign of the prophet Jonas. What is the sign of the prophet? It is the sign of the *resurrection*. The prophets are the resurrected. They are those who have abandoned the Egyptian state of consciousness, and have graduated in the school of adversity. They are those who have died to the world, and who live to God. They are the friends of God, the sons of God, the servants of God. They are pure and upright souls in whom the Spirit of God is said to be "awake" (Job 8⁶). They are holy souls into which the Holy Spirit, or Wisdom has entered. "Wisdom maketh all things new: and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God, and prophets" (Wisd. of Sol. 7²⁷). They are born of water, and of the Spirit; they are those upon whom the dove, the Holy Spirit, has descended. The psychological fact, or change, which constitutes a man a prophet is the resurrection from the dead. It is his resurrection out of an animalized state of consciousness into a state of humanism, or spirituality, and of peace.'

Take a little more about Jonah: he is as good as any other: 'Jonah is in the Egyptian state of consciousness; he is wedded to the things of the world. All persons in this state are described in the Scriptures as asleep or dead; they are so described because they are oblivious to spiritual things. "There was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken" . . . and Jonah "*was fast asleep*". So the shipmaster came to him, and said unto him, What meanest thou, O sleeper? arise, call upon thy God." The shipmaster acts in obedience to reason; he is evidently on the upper deck; but the crew seems to have been of the progeny of Ham. The mariners were afraid, and cried every man unto his god, and they cast forth the wares that were in the ship to lighten it. There comes a time in the evolution of the human soul, when all earthly things must be sacrificed, if it would find a haven of rest and peace. The ship's crew casts lots in order to determine who is responsible for the evil that was upon them, "and the lot fell upon Jonah."

That is the way in which the Science of Psychology has come upon us at last.

THE CONGREGATIONAL HYMNARY.

We should like, not only to draw attention to the fact that a new edition has been issued of the *Congregational Hymnary* (London: Memorial Hall; various prices), but to encourage the sale of it, even without the bounds of the Congregational Churches. For this is a remarkable book and must be regarded as a landmark in the history of Hymnology. It contains 771 hymns, 116 chants, and 117 anthems, and yet it is a selection. It is a selection—note the fact—unhampered either by theological or by ritualistic restrictions. It has nothing sectarian in it, and it probably contains every really Catholic and worthy hymn that has ever been written.

One matter may be mentioned. The hymns have, 'as far as possible,' been printed according to the original texts. When an alteration has been made, it has invariably been indicated. That is right. If it is the alternative of a slight alteration or the omission of a good hymn, then the hymn should be altered. For a hymn is not a poem. The alteration of a poem is unpardonable. Blake's great lines :

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land

are constantly quoted with 'mortal' substituted for 'mental,' and even 'I' for 'we' at the beginning of the third line. That, we say, is unpardonable, whether it is done of intention or of ignorance. But a hymn is for public singing, and it is of more importance that the congregation should be able sincerely to sing it than that the original wording of it should be preserved.

LYMAN ABBOTT.

Dr. Lyman Abbott has written his *Reminiscences* (Constable; 15s. net). At the end of the book he says: 'I am writing these pages on the 25th day of June, 1915; on the 18th of next December I shall be eighty years of age. I cannot believe it. I seem to myself to be in better health than I was at eighteen. My interest in present problems and my hopes for the future of my country are as great as they ever were.' This has been lightly called (and chiefly in America) the age of the young: we must reconsider and rename it.

Dr. Abbott succeeded Henry Ward Beecher as pastor of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn. That step in life made him known everywhere. He was already known in the States as a successful editor. He had previously been an advocate, and the pastor of more than one small congregational church. Now the successor to a preacher of great fame has a difficult duty to fulfil. Dr. Lyman Abbott was very different in appearance and in manner from Beecher. And the difference was half his success. He did succeed. 'A disinterested and trustworthy observer reported, as the result of his observation on a Sunday in June, when congregations were already beginning to scatter, that "there was not a crowding in the aisles and about the doors, as there was in the old days when strangers from abroad were attracted by the fame of Mr. Beecher. But, for all that, the church was full, floor and galleries."'

Dr. Abbott was an extemporaneous preacher. That is to say, he did not read his sermons. Sometimes he was really extemporaneous. He tells this story: 'One Saturday at Cornwall during my summer vacation I received a telegram from the secretary of the National Prison Reform Association, asking me to preach the sermon at the annual meeting to be held the Sunday of the week following at Saratoga Springs. I am sure that my friend would not have telegraphed me unless he had been in some special need, and, after some hesitation, I telegraphed back my consent. I tried in vain to get a theme for my Sunday sermon.

'At length, burdened by a feeling of desperation indescribable, I went to bed, after the briefest of prayers, in which I said that I thought my Father had called me to Saratoga Springs, I did not know why, and, if I needed the discipline of a humiliating failure, I prayed that I might be enabled to learn the lesson it was meant to teach me, and then—I tried to go to sleep. Did I? I do not know. I only know that in a very few moments I suddenly awoke to consciousness with my subject, my text, and my sermon in my mind. Criminals are the enemies of society. How does the New Testament tell us we should treat our enemies? "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath. . . . If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. . . . Overcome evil with good." The whole truth flashed upon me—now the axiom of prison reformers, but then radical even to them. We have no right to

visit retribution upon wrong-doers. This is not the era of judgment; it is the era of redemption. We have not the capacity to organize or administer a system of retributive justice. Our duty is to reform, not to punish, and to punish only that we may reform. We should abandon our system of justice and substitute a system of cure. My brain was on fire. I jotted the barest outline on a scrap of paper, and then tried to sleep that I might be able on the morrow to give to others the message which had been given to me. When it was given, the members crowded around me with congratulations. I was formally requested to furnish it for publication. Some friend, knowing my habit of extemporaneous speech, had arranged, unknown to me, for a shorthand report. It was published as reported, with very slight revision, and, I have been told, served as a new and spiritual definition of the essential principle of penology—fitting the penalty, not to the crime, but to the criminal.'

Dr. Abbott calls himself one of the 'new thinkers.' That is not the name of a sect, scarcely even of a movement. It means that he considered himself a preacher with an open mind. He completes one chapter (and we shall complete this notice) by naming the new thinkers of his day: 'Dr. George A. Gordon, the philosophic interpreter of the movement, in whom is combined a thorough familiarity with the best thoughts of the past and a spirit thoroughly modern; Dr. Theodore A. Munger, the perfection of whose style, the natural expression of a carefully perfected thought, has made his writings the more effective because they were never controversial; Dr. Washington Gladden, whose judicial temper enabling him to see all sides of controverted questions has been combined with an intensity of conviction not often found in so catholic a spirit; President Henry Churchill King, of Oberlin, who has interpreted by his writings with great clearness and felicity the change from a purely individualistic to a social Christianity; Dr. William Newton Clarke, of Colgate University, whose "Christian Theology" is the most religious book on systematic theology I have ever read—I am almost inclined to say, the only one; Edward Everett Hale, whose translation of faith, hope, and love into modern phraseology has made it a motto in many Christian households; John G. Whittier, whose religious poetry is luminous with the Inner Light in which he so devoutly trusted; and Phillips Brooks, whose personality, more eloquent even

than his winged words, made him the most prophetic preacher of his time.'

A philosophical author rarely expects a rapid sale. The late Professor William James, after his first experience, expected it. And he knew that he owed it to his marvellous English style. But a good philosophical book always finds a steady sale. And it is no surprise that the late Professor D. G. Ritchie's *Natural Rights* has appeared in its third edition (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). It is one of the books most frequently and most confidently recommended to students of Political Science. If we may speak of a scientific classic at all, it is a scientific classic.

An Essay on Shakespeare's Relation to Tradition has been written by Janet Spens, D.Litt., Resident English Tutor at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). The title suggests things purely literary and superficial. The book introduces us to things of deepest import. Often has it been said that the materials Shakespeare worked on were there for ordinary use, it was he that made them extraordinary. But there is more in it than that. In using materials which were there to his hand Shakespeare was greater than if he had created them—just as the new doctrine of evolution is more glorious to God than the old doctrine of creation 'out of nothing.' He made us see what comedy is and what tragedy, not in the lives of men and women who were fashioned by himself to that end, but in the lives of the men and women who were there already. It was not a world of his making that he gave us, it was eyes to see our own world.

And this, says Dr. Spens, is one of the things he enabled us to see—that tragedy belongs to the individual, to every individual; and that it is understood only when individuals are taken together, as in a family of two generations.

When the war is over, and men who have seen reality return to go to church or abstain, how are we to encourage them in church-going? Give them a short (unread) sermon in the morning and a longer (well-read) lecture in the evening. And, for sample of the evening lecture, get the Rev. Andrew Tweedie's book *A Sketch of Amos and Hosea* (Blackwood; 2s. 6d. net). Canon Streeter

says that a connected course holds a congregation better than unrelated subjects. Here are two excellent courses which have held and benefited one congregation.

How is it that so many persons who profess to believe in Christ doubt the fact of immortality? If the evidence for belief in God is prayer, we should say that the evidence for faith in Christ is the assurance of life everlasting. If we do not believe in a hereafter for those that are His, we do not believe in Him. Yet books innumerable are written to prove, apart from Christ, that immortality is a fact, and as they are written they are hungrily read.

The latest book has been written by the Rev. Charles Lewis Slattery, D.D., Rector of Grace Church in New York. Its title is *The Gift of Immortality* (Constable; 5s. net). Dr. Slattery's proof (he knows it is not an absolute proof) consists of three parts: first, the individual as an individual is pledged to immortality; next, the race as a race is pledged; and lastly, God is pledged to it. These three, being what they are, are witnesses to the fact of a life beyond this life.

Is Schism Lawful? The answer is already known when we know that the Rev. Edward Maguire answered it in an Essay which he presented to the Theological Faculty of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, as a Thesis for the Degree of Doctor. The answer however involves, or at least includes, a survey of Primitive Ecclesiology. The volume is published by Messrs. M. H. Gill & Son, in Dublin (5s. net).

Among other things, it includes a discussion of the Rock upon which the Church is built. Dr. Maguire (we hope he received the doctorate) holds by Simon as the Rock-foundation, and by Simon alone. He will have none of Dr. Gore's 'apostolic representativeness,' and none of Dr. Lindsay's 'Christian representativeness.' Neither did Simon stand for the Twelve, nor did he stand for the Church. He stood for himself alone.

How can Dr. Maguire do otherwise? The language about the Rock is parallel to the language about the Body. If 'Hoc est corpus meum' can only mean that the bread and wine are the literal Body of the Lord, then 'Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram' can only mean that Peter is the Rock, and Peter only. For just as Luther empha-

sized *Hoc est*, so Dr. Maguire emphasizes *Tu es*—This *is* the Body: thou *art* the Rock.

It is a pity (a pity for his case, we mean) that Dr. Maguire proceeds to quote the Greek—and to translate it. For the Greek means simply, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' But Dr. Maguire translates it, 'Thou art Rock (which needs *πέτρα*, not *πέτρος*); and he slips in a 'very,' which is not required at all—'Thou art Rock, and upon this very rock.' But he is wise to quote the French. For there the two words are identical; and as he says, triumphantly, 'The reader can see at once that Simon is the Rock upon which Christ promises to build His Church: "Tu es Pierre et sur cette pierre."'

The Ministry of Reconciliation (Headley; 1s. net). 'This book is the work of men who believe that war is indefensible from the Christian standpoint.' Do not all men believe that? Does it follow that a Christian must under no circumstances take part in war? That is what these men believe. 'Other men, actuated by motives just as noble, and with as sincere a desire to follow Christ, have felt that they had no option but active support of the war. We believe that they are wrong, and we have tried to explain why, but we do not judge them. For ourselves we cannot do otherwise: for us, discipleship of Jesus Christ involves abstention from war.'

The tone is good, whatever the conclusion may be. The tone could not be better. Perhaps it owes something of its fineness to the conclusion. In any case this book may be read profitably even by the keenest advocate of war—the keener perhaps the more profitably.

Professor Henry Sloane Coffin, one of whose books was noticed only two months ago, has now published a book on *The Ten Commandments* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). In this paragraph we see the theory and practice of the Ten Commandments, and understand Professor Coffin's book.

'Scholars tell us that the Hebrews took over the habit of dividing time up into weeks of seven days from their Semitic ancestors in Babylonia, from whom also came the idea of holding one of these days as sacred to the gods, a day of ill-omen on which to work or journey. But Israel's faith transmuted everything it received in its heritage; and

what it made out of this day, its ancestors considered unlucky for work, discloses the kind of God Israel worshipped, the sort of festival they thought would please Him. Its sabbath was primarily a humane day: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest; that thine ox and thine ass may have rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the sojourner may be refreshed." "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt." Our Lord gave the true interpretation of the meaning of the day, as it was understood by Israel's spiritual leaders who had planted it in the consciences of their people, when He said: "The sabbath was made for man." Israel's God differed from the deities of Babylon in His humaneness; He cared for the slave, the stranger, and the dumb cattle. A day set apart to Him must be a humane day; and the sabbath was an early step in leading Israel up to the conviction that God is love.

The Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, has added to his long list of theological works a small book on *The Psalter: Its Growth, Character, and Use* (Longmans; 1s. net). 'I have drawn very freely,' he says, 'on Dr. Kirkpatrick's book on the Psalms, and on the article by Professor W. T. Davison on the Book of Psalms in Hastings' DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. My attempt has been to bring together in a short form for ordinarily intelligent people a summary of some of the conclusions of scholars, with a view to a better understanding of the Psalms, especially as they are used in the Church's service.'

The first set of lectures under the Pringle Stuart Foundation has been delivered by the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A. The founder of the lectureship gave his benefaction for the purpose of promoting the study of the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, and also of the writings of John Keble. Mr. Lacey accordingly turned to St. Augustine. Here is an early Father. If Keble could not be added, at least he need not be contradicted. Mr. Lacey felt sure that in what he would say about the depravity of human nature in Augustine and

his writings would agree well with what Keble might have said and in some degree did say.

Now human nature, in the teaching of St. Augustine is inseparable from the nature of the Universe. And the nature of the Universe cannot be discussed without discussing miracle. The title of the book accordingly is *Nature, Miracle, and Sin: A Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order* (Longmans; 6s. net).

And Mr. Lacey sticks to his text. He has a modern mind, if we understand what that is; and he has a modern way of speaking his mind. In these days of theological disgust few will be attracted to the book by its title. And theirs will be the loss. Mr. Lacey is interested in St. Augustine, but he is more interested in you and me. And every word he utters touches us more or less intimately. The subject of 'Sin' is, of course, for ever interesting, more's the pity. 'Nature' is coming rapidly within the sphere of our close concerns. And even on 'Miracle' there is a discussion which keeps in touch with reality and promises things to come. St. Augustine's conception of Nature was so elastic that he found ample room for miracle within it; Mr. Lacey thinks it possible that we may soon achieve another conception equally elastic.

A description and translation of *The Coptic Psalter in the Freer Collection* has been made by Mr. William H. Worrell; and it has been published most handsomely by the Macmillan Company of New York (\$2 net). Only Coptic students will seek it out; but students of the Psalter, if they are at all enthusiastic, will see that they read at least its Introduction. It will be worth any man's while, if he is publishing however small a commentary on the Book of Psalms, to add to his literature this new book, and show that he knows what is in it.

Was Plato a Christian? How gladly would the Rev. William Temple say Yes. And he came so near. How admirable is his idea of Justice. But 'noble as is the picture of Justice, it is still not love; for love finds sacrifice its most natural expression and does not stop to balance up the good abandoned and the good secured, for it knows that in itself, active in sacrifice as it is, it has a value greater than either. It is just this failure to pass from justice to love which prevents.

Plato from finally rounding off his system ; for the Idea of Good, as we have seen, is justice in the universe. All the parts exist to serve the whole ; so far so good ; but he never went on to say that the whole exists for service of the parts ; nor did anyone else say so until God came into the world and shewed His love alike by life and by death.' So Plato was not a Christian. How near and yet how far is very attractively set forth in three lectures on *Plato and Christianity* (Macmillan ; 2s. net).

Mr. R. A. Gregory, Professor of Astronomy in Queen's College, London, has written many scientific books, or collaborated with other men in the writing of them. But he has never written anything so truly great as the book which has just been published, and to which he has given the title of *Discovery* (Macmillan ; 5s. net). The very idea which informs it is great. It is to tell the world what science is and what it aims at accomplishing. In telling us what science seeks to do, Professor Gregory cannot help telling us something of what it has done. But it is principles not results that he is concerned with.

The titles of the chapters are attractive—Outlook and Endeavour, Truth and Testimony, the Scientific Mind, Inquiry and Interpretation, the Conquest of Disease, and seven more. And the contents of each chapter are as attractive as its title. For Professor Gregory means to make this book popular. He has written it in language that is 'understood of the people,' and with an appeal to the universal imagination. To add to its popularity the publishers have reproduced eight famous paintings—all symbolical of some aspect of scientific purpose.

Dr. W. Rhys Roberts, Professor of Classics in the University of Leeds, gave an address on *Patriotic Poetry, Greek and English*, on the 500th Anniversary of Agincourt. Now he has published the address, adding many Notes to it, giving references, and throwing into the bargain four illustrations (Murray ; 3s. 6d. net). We do not know which to prefer, the address or the notes or the illustrations. The Notes are sometimes little more than quotation of authorities used ; but then they are sometimes independent discussions of deeply interesting matters, like the synonyms for patriotism — motherland, fatherland — and the

curious history of that word 'patriotism' itself. Throughout the book there is a very pretty mixture of Greek and English, Ancient and Modern ; and ever the difference is maintained between the pseudo-patriotism which is selfishness and the true patriotism which is self-sacrifice. After a word on Callinus, we read : 'Callinus is one of the very first in that long line of poet-warriors which includes the psalmist David, Tyrtæus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Ennius, Sidney ["Sidney, as he fought, And as he fell, and as he lived and moved" : Shelley, *Adonais*, xlv.], D'Annunzio, Rupert Brooke.'

Messrs. Oliphant are to be commended for their enterprise in issuing in time of war so many books which do not deal with war, and for the attractive originality which they have exercised in the production of them. One of their new books is called *Hidden Pictures ; or, How the New Testament is Concealed in the Old Testament*, by Ada R. Habershon (3s. 6d. net). In it the story is retold of all those incidents in the Old Testament which have been used for evangelical instruction. The story is retold with literary skill, and the instruction is brought out with spiritual insight. The short chapters of the book could be read easily at a meeting of workers. The book itself would be a gift much valued by a sincere Christian, old or young.

Is it possible to find Christ throughout the Old Testament without breaking the laws of true interpretation ? This is what the Rev. Francis L. Denman, M.A., Vicar of Cold Harbour, Surrey, has tried to do in a book entitled *Christ in Holy Scripture* (Oliphants ; 1s. 6d. net). His method is to identify the Jehovah of the Old Testament with the Christ of the New. And that is legitimate enough ; for it is done in the New Testament itself.

Seven quite exceptionally fine evangelical booklets have been published by Messrs. Oliphant at sixpence each.

1. *Not against Flesh and Blood*. By Alexander Whyte, D.D.

2. *The Invincible Love*. By the Rev. James Philip Lilley, D.D.

3. *The Forgotten Friend*. By Bessie Porter Head.

4. *The Way Home from the Homeland.* By Dan Crawford.

5. *The Supreme Need.* By Andrew Murray, D.D.

6. *When the Boys Come Home.* By Lettice Bell.

7. *The Shining Path.* By the Rev. Dr. John Hume Townsend.

Not a word more need be said about them. The choice of author and subject gives variety of approach, but the approach is always unmistakably to the Cross. Send these wholesome Christian booklets to our soldiers and our sailors. They are as good to read, being written with style every one of them, as they are good for the saving of the soul.

We would have a reputation for wisdom, some of us, even if we had none for goodness. Well, 'he that winneth souls is wise.' And how that reputation may be made is told plainly in *The Soul-Winner and Soul-Winning*, by the Rev. Joseph W. Kemp (Oliphants; 1s. net).

The Soldier's Companion (Oliphants; 1s. net) contains 'messages of hope, comfort, and love' from many of the most acceptable devotional books, including the Bible. Some of the messages are in prose and some in poetry. They are arranged under general titles—Love to the Uttermost, Answering the Call, Onward and Upward, Gaining the Victory, the Peace of God. The little book is charmingly bound in khaki and made to be carried in the pocket.

Books on Prayer pour out of the publishing offices. The latest to come has a striking title: *The Dynamic of All-Prayer* (Oliphants; 2s. 6d. net). And it is a striking book. The author is a licentiate of the Royal Institute of British Architects, his name G. Granger Fleming. And not being known as a student of prayer, his book has been introduced by Dr. Andrew Murray. Dr. Murray says: 'If people can only be got to read and think out carefully the message this book contains, I feel confident it will lead many a one, not only to acknowledge that he has a new insight into what Prayer is, but deliberately to yield himself to Christ as one of His holy priesthood through whom the blessings of God's grace are to be dispensed to the world.' One thing may be added, that, however many books on prayer you have already, there

will be no overlapping if you give this one a place beside them.

In the same attractive printing and binding the same publishers have issued a book by Mr. Paget Wilkes on *The Dynamic of Faith* (2s. 6d. net). But the books are very different. Mr. Granger Fleming is 'original or nothing': Mr. Wilkes is content with a well-ordered attractive exposition of what faith is and what it does. That is a book for the thinker; this for the worker. That touched on philosophy; this clings close to the Word of God. We should say that the man who can write so clearly and so simply has mastered his subject more utterly than the seer.

To the 'American Lectures on the History of Religions' a volume has been added on *Mohammedanism* (Putnam; \$1.50 net). The author is C. Snouck Hurgronje, Professor of the Arabic Language in the University of Leiden. And that, to those who know, guarantees the book. Professor Snouck Hurgronje (after one or two attempts you get it) gave himself early and entirely to the study of Mohammedanism. In 1888 he was sent out to Batavia in Netherlands-India, and remained there, studying and teaching, till 1906. He has not confined himself to any special part of Islam, but has studied the Muslim faith in its widest aspects. For that reason his name has not yet appeared in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, but he is the better qualified to write such a general sketch as will be found in this volume.

Ever so many preachers have been sent by the war to the prophets. The Rev. T. W. Crafer, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge, has gone to Zechariah. In six living impressive sermons he has offered a message of Repentance and Hope, to the Nation and to every individual of it, based on Zechariah i.-viii. The title is *A Prophet's Visions and the War* (Skeffington; 2s. net).

Mrs. Humphry Ward knows that whatever she writes will command attention. She has written six letters to an American friend for the purpose of showing what Britain has done and is doing to bring the war to a successful end. She requested and obtained the privilege of visiting the munition factories, the Grand Fleet, and even the fighting army in France. She writes, therefore, not from

hearsay but from sight. The book is published under the title *England's Effort* (Smith, Elder; 2s. 6d. net).

It is a great story, and it loses nothing in the telling. Perhaps the seriousness is a little unrelieved, but the issue is serious, and it is a serious thing that we have been so misjudged in America and elsewhere. The only gleam of humour is in the Preface. There Mrs. Humphry Ward makes solemn apology for the title of her book—apology for ignoring in the title the contributions of Scotland and Ireland, of India and the Colonies. And what is her apology? That *England's Effort* (the title chosen) sounds best! 'Let anyone,' she says, 'try the alternatives which suggest themselves, and see how they roll—or do not roll—from the tongue.' Well, to be not less serious, *Does* 'England's Effort' roll from the tongue any better than 'Britain's Effort'? There is, however, the blessed alliteration. There is no getting over that. We might have suggested 'Britain's Bit,' but the last word wants a syllable for the rolling. Yes, the alliteration settles it. We commend this conclusion to the readers of the *Spectator*, where there has been a long but inconclusive controversy over the matter.

Questions of War and Peace (Fisher Unwin; 3s. 6d. net) are discussed by Mr. L. T. Hobhouse, D.Litt., Martin-White Professor of Sociology in the University of London, in three essays, two of which are thrown into the form of dialogue. The questions are just those which we are all discuss-

ing, so that the dialogue form is appropriate. They are concerned not so much with this war as with war, though the origin of this war and the responsibility for it are not left untouched. The book is easily read, and we have read it right through. But if any one were to ask us what Dr. Hobhouse's conclusions are we should not tell him, partly because we are not sure, and partly because it would serve no purpose. We must all reach our own conclusions. Discussion is the thing, and here it is. We must be taught to think.

Bishop Boyd Carpenter has the English gift of clearness. We may agree with what he says, or we may not agree, but we always know what he means to say. He delivered the Donnellan Lectures in Dublin in 1914, and in Westminster Abbey in 1916. He has now published them. The subject is *The Witness of Religious Experience* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net). The most popular title now is Mysticism, but Dr. Boyd Carpenter does not once use that word. His argument is that personal intercourse with God on the part of a believer in Him (Christian or not) is a fact. It is a fact which touches every part of a man's personality. It may become ours by the steady process of the opening of the life to God's Grace, or by the cataclysm which is called conversion. But it always consists in the surrender of the will. Jesus surrendered His will naturally (guard against the misuse of the word 'natural'); Paul surrendered his will cataclysmically. The issue is Communion with God, and the joy of it.

The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul.

By THE REV. C. W. EMMET, M.A., VICAR OF WEST HENDRED.

THE great interest attaching to the eschatological sections of 4 Esdras, such as the 'Son of Man' and the 'Eagle' Visions, has caused the quieter theological passages to be somewhat ignored. And yet they are of considerable importance for our understanding both of Judaism, and also of certain aspects of the New Testament, and in particular of Paulinism. Indeed, we may go further; they are of permanent religious value as giving poignant expression to those questions which vex

the thoughtful mind in every age, questions to which even Christianity can give no complete answer. The writer is in line both with Job and with the anxious religious inquirer of to-day; indeed at times his point of view is, as we shall see, extraordinarily modern. We shall not be surprised to find that his statement of difficulties is sometimes more convincing than his answers. This feature really adds to the value of the book; it is no superficial apologetic, but the faithful record

of the obstinate questionings of an honest and religious soul, which realizes the weakness of its own solutions and does not attempt to gloss them over with an air of spurious finality.

The discussions which are important for our purpose are found exclusively in what is known as the Salathiel Apocalypse. The researches of Kabisch, Box, and others have shown pretty conclusively that 4 Esdras is a composite work.¹ We need not enter into the details of the analysis; it is sufficient to say that this Apocalypse is contained in chaps. 3-10, except for four interpolated eschatological passages, and in 12⁴⁰⁻⁴⁸ 14²⁸⁻³⁵. It receives its title from 3¹, 'In the thirtieth year after the downfall of the city, I, Salathiel—who am also Ezra—was in Babylon.'² Salathiel³ (Heb. Shealtiel) is only mentioned as the father, or uncle, of Zerubbabel, and the identification of him with Ezra is at once a sign of the artificial combination of sources. The date supposed in the text—556 B.C.—is a century before Ezra's appearance. But though the nominal reference is—after the manner of Apocalyptic—to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the real reference is undoubtedly to its fall in 70 A.D. The date of the Salathiel Apocalypse is therefore fixed thirty

¹ See Box, *Ezra Apocalypse*, and *4 Ezra* in the Oxford Corpus of *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. The distinctive character of the theology of S (Salathiel Apocalypse) has already been recognized by Box and others. The difference between the sources in this respect is, in fact, very marked. I had myself previously worked over the book from the point of view of the different sources, but had occasion after some considerable interval to study it with reference to the bearing of its religious ideas on the theology of St. Paul, especially in Romans. For this purpose I was taking the book as it stood, and it was not till I had nearly completed it that I realized that all the passages which I had marked as significant were from S, and that the other strata, including those separated off from S by Box in chaps. 3-10, had practically no bearing on this particular subject (of course they are important for St. Paul's eschatology and conception of Christ). The point is perhaps worth noting as a small independent verification of the validity of the critical analysis.

² The quotations throughout are from Box's translation in the Oxford Corpus.

³ It is curious to find the name in a boy-actor, Salathiel Pavy, on whom Ben Jonson wrote an elegy (see Lee, *Life of William Shakespeare*, p. 342). Those who are learned in the use of the Apocrypha in the Middle Ages may be able to tell us whether it was ever a common proper name.

years after this, or 100 A.D.; 4 Esdras as it stands is slightly later.

The date is important as giving the keynote to the book. The writer is faced by the problem of God's apparent rejection of His people in the great catastrophe which had overtaken the nation. The thought recurs again and again, and reaches its climax in the vision of chap. 10, especially vv.^{21ff.}:

'For thou seest how our sanctuary is laid waste, our altar thrown down; our temple destroyed, our harp laid low; our song is silenced, our rejoicing ceased; the light of our lamp is extinguished, the ark of our Covenant spoiled; our holy things are defiled, the name that is called upon us is profaned; . . . and what is more than all—Sion's seal is now sealed up dishonoured, and given up into the hands of them which hate us.'

In keeping with this idea the book contains some of the classical expressions of Jewish nationalism, e.g. 5^{23ff.}:

'O Lord, my Lord, out of all the woods of the earth and all the trees thereof thou hast chosen thee one vine; out of all the lands of the world thou hast chosen thee one planting-ground; out of all the flowers of the world thou hast chosen thee one lily; out of all the depths of the sea thou hast replenished for thyself one river; out of all the cities that have been built thou hast sanctified Sion unto thyself; . . . out of all the peoples who have become so numerous thou hast gotten thee one people: and the law which thou didst approve out of all laws thou hast bestowed upon the people whom thou didst desire. And now, O Lord, why hast thou delivered up the one unto the many, and dishonoured the one root above the rest, and scattered thine only one among the multitude?'

Or again: 'Thou hast said that for our sakes thou hast created this world. But as for the other nations, which are descended from Adam, thou hast said that they are nothing, and that they are like unto spittle; and thou hast likened the abundance of them to a drop on a bucket' (6^{55f.}). If Israel has sinned, the nations are much worse (3^{28ff.}); the law was offered to them and they have rejected it (7^{21ff.}). If this were all, the book would be of no special significance. Its peculiar value lies in the way in which a wider outlook is revealed. Again and again, the writer, almost against his will, finds himself compelled to face the larger problems of the fate of man as man. He is at once catholic, as concerned with the fate

of the Gentiles, and individualistic, as thinking of the individual soul no less than of the nation as a whole. The problem of the future of the Jew turns out to be, after all, only a phase of the problem of the fate of the human race. If so few are to be saved, why was man made at all?

'O thou earth, what hast thou brought forth, if the mind is sprung from the dust as every other created thing! It had been better if the dust itself had even been unborn, that the mind might not have come into being from it. But as it is, the mind grows with us, and on this account we are tormented, because we perish and know it. Let the human race lament, but the beasts of the field be glad! Let all the earth-born mourn, but let the cattle and flocks rejoice! For it is far better with them than with us; for they have no judgment to look for, neither do they know of any torture or of any salvation promised to them after death. But what doth it profit us that we shall be preserved alive, but yet suffer great torment? For all the earth-born are defiled with iniquities, full of sins, laden with offences. And if after death we were not to come into judgement, it might, perchance, have been far better for us' (7^{62ff.}).

'This is my first and last word; better had it been that the earth had not produced Adam, or else, having once produced him, for thee to have restrained him from sinning. For how doth it profit us all that in the present we must live in grief, and after death look for punishment?' (7^{116ff.}; see also 10^{9f.}).

What, indeed, is the purpose of the infinite skill and labour lavished upon man? 'We are all one fashioning, the work of thine hands, as thou hast said. . . . And afterwards thou sustainest it in thy mercy, and nourishest it in thy righteousness; thou disciplinest it through thy law, and reprovest it in thy wisdom. Thou wilt kill it—as it is thy creature, and quicken it—as it is thy work! If then, with a light word thou shalt destroy him who with such infinite labour has been fashioned by thy command, to what purpose was he made?' (87^{ff.}).

The angel's answer to these questions points to the 'waste of nature': 'Just as the husbandman sows much seed upon the ground and plants a multitude of plants, and yet not all which were sown shall be saved in due season, nor shall all that were planted take root; so also they that are sown in the world shall not all be saved' (84^{ff.}; cf. 9²¹). This analogy is clearly no solution, since

it only puts the difficulty a stage further back; but the whole discussion is very modern in tone and argument. It shows the moral difficulty presented, indeed, by every view of eternal punishment, but enormously heightened when it is held that this is the fate preserved for the vast majority of mankind, and a fate which they have practically no chance of escaping.

But while this great problem is so clearly stated, we find that it is deliberately put aside. 'Concerning man in general thou knowest best' (81⁵); 'For, indeed,' says the angel, 'I will not concern myself about the creation of those who have sinned, or their death, judgement, or perdition' (83⁸; cf. 9¹³). We are to understand that the writer feels that the wider question is beyond him, and therefore, superficially at least, he consents to confine himself to the problem of Israel.

Here his primary explanation is found in the fact of sin, the interest of his treatment lying in the way in which he emphasizes its connexion with Adam. It should be remembered that this point of view was not usual in Judaism (see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 137); the Apocalypse of Baruch comes nearest to 4 Esdras, but there it is mainly physical death and other evils which are traced to him; there is no real doctrine of original sin; see especially 54¹⁹, 'Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.' The teaching of 4 Esdras goes further: 'Thou appointedst death for him [Adam] and for his generations, and from him were born nations and tribes, peoples and clans innumerable, and every nation walked after their own will and behaved wickedly before thee' (37⁷). 'For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise all that were born of him' (32¹). 'For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning, and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced unto this time, and shall yet produce until the threshing-floor come!' (43⁰). 'O thou Adam, what hast thou done? For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants!' (71¹⁸; cf. v. 11).

The writer therefore teaches the universality of sin (74^{6, 88} etc.), though at the same time he holds that a few are not indeed sinless, but yet have a sufficiency of 'works' to win salvation (83³). The angel includes Salathiel among the

number (7⁷⁷), but he himself in a remarkable manner expresses his sense of his own sinfulness; 'We and our fathers have passed our lives in ways that bring death' (8³¹). He is praised by the angel, 'because thou hast humbled thyself, as it becomes thee, and hast not assigned thyself a place among the righteous' (8⁴⁹). We must of course allow for the dramatic convention which naturally ascribes a considerable degree of sanctity to the seer under whose name the book is written; it is clear that the writer himself had a real sense of personal sin. A remarkable feature of 4 Esdras is the pathetic longing for some means of salvation, some 'gospel' not only of forgiveness—that as a Jew he accepts, though in an undefined and limited sense—but of power to conquer sin. 'O Lord above us, if thou wouldst but suffer thy servant to pray before thee; and wouldst give unto us the seed of a new heart and culture to our understanding, whence fruit may come, whereby every corruptible one may be able to live, who bears the form of man!' (8⁶). No doubt there are glorious promises of God held out as the reward of obedience and righteousness, but what are these to those who are only conscious of failure? 'For how does it profit us that the eternal age is promised to us, whereas we have done the works that bring death? And that there is foretold to us an imperishable hope, whereas we so miserably are brought to futility? And that there are reserved habitations of health and safety, whereas we have lived wickedly? And that the glory of the Most High is to defend them who have led a pure life, whereas we have walked in ways most wicked?' (7^{19ff.}). What is the value of the reward promised to works¹ to those who are conscious of having none? (8^{32ff.}). The law indeed has its promises of life, and its supremacy and abiding value are strongly emphasized, but nowhere is there any hint that it has within it the germ of any gospel for the sinner. 'Yea, rather, let the many that now are perish than that the law of God which is set before them be despised' (7²⁰).

The upshot is that the writer finds himself compelled to acquiesce in a small inner circle of the saved, a select aristocracy of spiritual supermen.

¹ 'Faith' is indeed mentioned side by side with 'works' in 9⁷ 13²³ (neither of these passages belongs to S), and there are hints of faith in S itself, but its general meaning is simply fidelity to the law; see Box on 6⁵.

'I will rejoice,' says the angel, 'over the few that shall be saved . . . and I will not grieve over the multitude of them that perish' (7^{60f.}). 'Many have been created, but few shall be saved' (8³). 'And I saw, and spared some with very great difficulty, and saved me a grape out of a cluster, and a plant out of a great forest. Perish then the multitude which has been born in vain; but let my grape be preserved and my plant, which with much labour I have perfected' (9^{21f.}).²

This solution clearly leaves the writer's conscience uneasy, and he can salve it only by having recourse to two principles, which must indeed form an element in the ultimate answer to all fundamental religious problems. The first principle is that man cannot hope to understand the ways of God. 'The way of the Most High has been formed without measure; how then should it be possible for a mortal in a corruptible world to understand the ways of the Incorruptible?' (4¹¹; cf. v. 21). 'Thou art not a judge above God nor wise above the Most High' (7¹⁹). With this principle we connect the frequent references to predestination and to God's power as Creator; man is after all but clay in the hand of the potter, who may work his will upon him, with none to say him nay (7⁵² 8² etc.). The writer here re-echoes the teaching of Job; the answer is really the abandonment of all attempt to find a solution, and Salathiel, in a passage with a curiously modern spirit, boldly ventures the question why, if this is all that can be said, man should be endowed with reason at all? 'I beseech thee, O Lord, wherefore have I been endowed with an understanding to discern?' (4²²). This falling back on the inscrutability of God's ways cannot, in fact, be allowed to hold good, if it stands alone. For, after all, what guarantee has man that there is a solution at all, or that, if there is, it in any way corresponds to his own desires, or to the claims either of reason or of conscience? Its value for religion depends entirely on the second principle to which appeal is made, and here the religious teaching of our Apocalypse reaches its climax. It is the appeal to the love of God: 'Art thou in sore perplexity concerning Israel? Lovest

² It should be noted that in the description of rewards and punishments after death in 7^{82ff.} there are noble ethical features; the wicked 'pine away with shame in that they see the glory of the Most High, before whom they have sinned in life,' while the climax of the joys of the righteous is that 'they are hastening to behold the face of him whom in life they served.'

thou him better than he that made him?' 'Thou art powerless to discover my judgement or the goal of the love that I have declared unto my people' (5^{33. 40}); 'Thou comest far short of being able to love my creation more than I' (8⁴⁷; cf. v. 59). If this faith is well grounded, man can indeed wait with patience for the new age, bearing the sorrow and impotence of this (5^{27ff. 10}). It is from a slightly different point of view the lesson of Browning's Saul, as it is also the teaching of the New Testament and particularly of St. Paul in Romans. We are, however, bound to remark that Salathiel has no fact to which he can appeal as the pledge of the love on which he throws himself with so noble a faith.

Here we may pass to the main point which we wish to emphasize. The reader will have already noted that the problems which troubled our unknown author are the same as those which troubled St. Paul. He too was compelled to face the question, 'Hath God cast off His people?' not indeed under the pressure of a grave national disaster, but in view of the fact that Israel itself had turned traitor to its destiny, and that the Gentiles had entered into the heritage of the Messianic Kingdom. He too feels the burden of sin and its universality, and traces it to the entail left by Adam's fall. Far more keenly and decisively has he realized the impotence of Law to save. No doubt he that doeth the works of the law shall live thereby; but what gospel is this in the face of man's universal failure and weakness? Again, he realizes even more clearly than the other that the problem of sin and salvation cannot be confined to Israel, and that, whatever the answer may be, it must include the Gentile world as well. On one side his solution is of course startlingly different; he has an answer in the gospel of Christ, with its universality, its promise of redemption, power, and hope, where the Jew has none. Writing when he did, the latter must have had some familiarity with Christian teaching, but nowhere does he betray the least sympathy with it. On the contrary, there are passages which seem to be definitely directed against it, e.g. when he is told that 'the end shall come through me alone and none other' (6⁶), or that 'even as now a father may not send a son, or a son a father . . . so shall none then pray for another on that Day, neither shall one lay a burden on another; for then every one shall bear his own righteousness or unrighteousness'

(7^{104ff.}). It is true that these passages might refer to tendencies at work within Judaism itself—the emphasis on the work of the Messiah, which some schools rejected, and a belief in the validity of intercession—but they gain in point if read as a polemic against the 'heresies' of the Christians.

But on another side there is a most striking coincidence in the principles to which appeal is made for a final solution. We have seen how 4 Esdras rests finally on the inscrutability of God's ways, based on His unchallengeable power as Creator, and on His fatherly love for His creation. These are precisely the two answers which are combined in Romans. In chap. 9 St. Paul makes his well-known appeal to the absolute authority of God as Creator—'Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?'—using the same familiar metaphor of the potter and the clay. The peroration of the section in 11^{33ff.} emphasizes the same principle, 'How unsearchable are his judgements and his ways past tracing out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?' On the other hand, in chap. 8, in dealing with the problem of the sufferings of this present time and the final deliverance of creation, he has asserted the love of God in Christ as the ground of hope and the pledge of the ultimate solution (8^{28ff.}; cf. 5⁵). The main difference is that he has the historical manifestation of that love to which he can point in vindication of his argument. The fact that both writers place these two principles side by side and that neither explicitly combines them is certainly worth notice.

There are other less important parallels between the two. Both draw the contrast between Isaac and Esau, with the same quotation from Hosea (4 Es 3¹⁶, Ro 9¹³). With 4 Es 7⁷², 'For this reason therefore shall the sojourners in the earth suffer torture, because having understanding they yet wrought iniquity, and receiving precepts they yet kept them not, and having obtained the law they set at naught that which they had received,' we naturally compare Ro 2¹⁻¹⁶, though St. Paul does not accept the common Jewish view that the Gentiles had been offered the law and had rejected it. 4 Es 7⁷³ embodies the same idea as Ro 2³, while the next verse refers to the long-suffering of God in delaying the judgment in the same way as Ro 2⁴, though the Jew declares that the delay is not for

man's sake. In 5⁴¹ we find the same interest in the fate of those who die before the end as is found in 1 Th 4¹³ (cf. 2 Bar 14).

What is the significance of these parallels? There is really no question of literary dependence on either side; St. Paul is, of course, the earlier of the two, and it does not appear probable that 4 Esdras borrows from him. The importance of the comparison lies in another direction. It shows that the problems which occupied the mind of St. Paul were also before the minds of other thoughtful Jews. They too were oppressed by sin and failure; they looked beyond the law for some means of deliverance, though they had not reached the point of unthroning the law from its position of supremacy. The contrast between God's choice of Israel and the facts of history presented a problem which refused the conventional solutions of the day, while the wider question of the fate of the Gentiles and of mankind as a whole refused to be ignored. To us the pressure of such problems is obvious, whatever our solution, and it may seem superfluous to labour the fact that they were felt by other Jews as well as by St. Paul. But they did not, in fact, loom large in the horizon of the average Rabbinic Jew, and this is no doubt one of the reasons why Christianity with its new solution did not appeal to him. We see from a contemporary writing such as 2 Baruch that it was not generally held that only a few even of the chosen people would be saved, and that there was little doubt as to the adequacy of the 'good works' of the average religious man. It may be useful to quote Mr. Montefiore's summary of the position of orthodox Rabbinism. 'There is therefore no need whatever for despair. No injunction of the law is too difficult for a man to seek to obey it . . . The breaches can be repaired. Human repentance, divine forgiveness; these are the methods . . . None but the deliberate and determined sinner need fail to grasp it [*sc.* the Law as a tree of Life]; none but the mocker and apostate are unable to uphold it . . . Rabbinic Judaism was convinced. . . . that for every decent Israelite there was a place in the future world, in "the life to come."'¹ Similarly, the ordinary Jew did not trouble himself about the fate of the Gentiles. 'The fate of the outsider did not thrust itself persistently within the circle of his thought, and even when it did, he could, such is the

pathetic inconsistency of the human mind, consign the outsider to perdition and truly love God at one and the same time.'² Mr. Montefiore recognizes more than once that 4 Esdras belongs to a different school of thought, and that it is in line with the type of Judaism presupposed in the Pauline Epistles; in other words, according to the thesis maintained by Mr. Montefiore, it represents the Judaism of the Diaspora. Canon Box³ also takes the view that the tendencies found in the Salathiel Apocalypse 'suggest perhaps the influence of Alexandrian rather than specifically Palestinian thought.' Palestine, he reminds us, 'was saturated with Hellenistic influence at this period, and Palestinian Judaism was profoundly affected by it.' On the whole the parallelism between St. Paul and 4 Esdras goes to support Mr. Montefiore's thesis that the Apostle's pre-Christian Judaism was not of the ordinary Rabbinic type, though it does not necessarily follow that it may not have been learnt, at least in part, in Jerusalem. Whether this type was, as he argues, 'poorer' and 'inferior' is of course another question. It is at least arguable that such a book as the Apocalypse we have been considering does face the facts of the world and of human nature in a way that 2 Baruch or ordinary Rabbinism do not. A pessimism which comes from a resolute determination to do this may at any rate prepare the way for an optimism based on a sure foundation. We can only raise these questions here in passing and suggest that the comparison of 4 Esdras with St. Paul and a fuller study of its provenance may throw further light on the Jewish background of Paulinism and on the interesting point of view brought forward by Mr. Montefiore. This at least is clear: the author of the Salathiel Apocalypse is our best representative of the kind of Jewish thought with which St. Paul must have been in sympathy in his pre-Christian days. Had he not become a Christian, he might have written just such another book as 4 Esdras, while our unknown author would have surely been a strong 'Paulinist' had he been able to adopt the Christian solution of the problems he faced so bravely. As it is, the poignancy with which he states the difficulties and the very inadequacy of his answers may serve to emphasize the value of the teaching of St. Paul and the New Testament.

² *Ibid.* p. 57.

³ *Apoc. and Pseud. of the O.T.*, ii. p. 557.

¹ *Judaism and St. Paul*, pp. 43 f.

Christ's Confidence in His Perpetual Presence.

BY THE REV. W. MORISON, D.D., EDINBURGH.

WHAT is most originaive in the Christian faith is that it is faith in a living and present Saviour. The weight of our faith is thrown not on the death of Christ by itself, but on His death and resurrection. 'It is Christ that died, *yea rather* that is risen again, who ever liveth!' We believe in a Saviour who died for us, *but is not dead*. 'His resurrection,' says Canon Scott Holland, 'was needed to give the momentum required for the origination of a new religion. A vision of unutterable beauty indeed the life would have been, but a vision that came and passed and vanished, before men's bewildered eyes had had time to receive it, or their hearts to apprehend what was there for a flashing moment in their midst.'

Had Christ the confidence that His death would not affect His presence with His people, save indeed in the way of making it closer and more powerful? That He had this confidence, He showed in every possible way.

No one can dispute that He believed that *His cause* would have a great future. As little can it be questioned that He believed that the fortunes of the Church were bound up with His own—that they would stand or fall together. In His teaching in regard to the relationship between Himself and His people there is one idea that is always present—namely, inseparableness. It was like that between the shepherd and the sheep, between the tree and the branches, between the head and the members of the body. In fact, their life was just His life in them. 'Because I live,' He said, 'ye shall live also.'

In the promises with which He consoled the disciples, on the eve of His departure, He assured them of His return. He said, 'I will not leave you comfortless, I will come to you.' His last word to them was, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.'

These are promises of His perpetual presence.

It is quite inadequate to interpret them otherwise. It is quite inadequate to interpret them as only meaning that He would always *live in the remembrance of the Church*, that the recollection of His life would never be lost, that He would leave an enduring memory. Even had He not meant

more than this, it would have disclosed a wonderful confidence in Himself. How was it possible, we may well ask ourselves, for one whose life was so brief, who played His part in the world in two or three years at the longest, and on so obscure a stage, and with so few and such negligible witnesses? How could He expect to live in the remembrance of men, and 'to their ears and tongues be theme and hearing ever'? He had but a poor scaffold in the world's eyes on which to rear such an edifice of hope—but a slight foundation on which to build such 'imaginary puissance.' Does it not, of itself, show His consciousness that on a stage so inconspicuous, and in a work day so contracted, He had rendered a vast, a profound, an inexhaustible service to mankind? The conviction that His life had in it a force which would project itself so far into history, proves how strong was His sense of His alliance with the Spirit of the Eternal.

But if Christ meant more than this, what was the more? Did He mean that *His work would live* in its effects on succeeding generations, that the spiritual ideas and inspirations He originated would pass into the moral life of the world, that the Divine movement He began would progress till its end was realized, and the Kingdom of God established on the earth? There is a sense in which every good life, every noble life, endures. It 'leaves its fibre in the work of the world; by so much evermore the strength of the race has gained.' Every beneficent movement it has initiated or supported spreads and grows. 'There is no great and noble idea once promulgated that does not triumph in the end, although it may traverse centuries of obstacles. There is no holy aspiration which, starting with a handful of believers, is not certain to increase in the number of its adherents.'

'The word unto the prophet spoken
Was writ in letters yet unbroken.
One accent of the Holy Ghost
The heedless world hath never lost.'

All this is supremely true of Christ and His influence. He lived to do the will of God, and so He abideth for ever.

But there is more than this—more than His confidence that His memory and work would

endure, that the influence of His life would persist, that faith in Him would pass, by contagion, from one soul to another, and from one generation to another, that His name would always keep its charm, and His life its freshness and fragrance, that His footsteps would never be obliterated but continue to guide men in the way of life, that He would inspire a devotion to His Person which would appear as unfailingly as the flowers of spring with each new age. What He promised was that He *would keep in living touch* with His people by the power of His eternal Spirit. We do not exhaust the causes which account for the persistence of our faith, we do not arrive at that which secures the operation of all the others, and without which they would fail, till we come to this cause. The Church lives on in the world only because Christ lives on in the Church. It is the breath of His Spirit that renews faith from age to age, that preserves and builds up the Church and spreads His Kingdom. It is by the insistence of His Spirit that the Kingdom makes its way into new generations, into new provinces of human activity, into new forms and developments of human society, into new regions of thought and feeling. Can the stream flow on, cut off from the spring? Can the branches bear fruit severed from the tree? Can the members of the body survive separated from the head? As little can the Church live apart from the living Christ.

This is what Christ meant by His promises to the disciples. He was still to be at their head to inspire and guide and strengthen them. He had not merely given them an original impulse which they were left to carry out themselves. No! They were still to be dependent on His presence with them. They were still to be in contact, in correspondence, in communication with the Captain of their Salvation.

The perpetual presence of Christ has always been the very nerve of the Church's confidence. It was so to the disciples. We know the effect which the promise of it had on them. It was such a consolation as turned His departure into an occasion of gladness. After He had departed from them they returned to Jerusalem 'with great joy.' Never was there a more unnatural, a more impossible joy, had they not believed that in the most real sense He would still be with them. From that day they became new men, as courageous, as hopeful, as, immediately before, they had been

timid and despairing. His leaving them might rather have been His return to them. So indeed it was.

What I have said of the first disciples is true of all who have succeeded them. His presence has been the nerve of their confidence in all the struggles of the spiritual life, and in all their efforts to extend His Kingdom. It is not so much *back* to Christ as *up* to Christ they have looked for their power. They have sought it by prayer for His presence, and a fresh reinforcement from His Spirit. His memory, His example, His teaching, His life and work on earth—all have needed the touch of His own Spirit to make them effective. His servants have had more than the faith that Christ is living—they have had the faith that He is *living in them*, and that His hand is in contact with all their environment, to adjust His help to their need.

It is those who have done most and dared most for His Kingdom who have made most of the promise of His presence. As they have measured all their resources against the work they have been called to do they have felt that they were inadequate without it—without the working of His own Spirit with them. Like the disciples in the miracles in which Christ employed them, there was a part which they could do, but there was also a part that was beyond them. The disciples could bring the loaves and fishes and place them in Christ's hands; they could fill the waterpots with water and carry them into His presence; they could cast their nets upon the lake: but there they stopped: to the miraculous result they could but contribute their faith in their Master. And so in all their work for Christ His servants have found that after they had exhausted all their own power, they came to a point of impossibility, which needed the intervention of power from above, and where they had to wait in faith for its descent. There is not a page of missionary history, for example, which does not illustrate this truth. There is nothing more miraculous than the entrance which the missionaries of the Church have obtained into their fields of labour. They have gone to the most hostile peoples—they have gone with no external influence behind them—they have gone with nothing in their hands to barter for their spiritual opportunity—they have gone with a simple trust in their own beneficent purpose, and in Him who put it into their hearts, and the door has

opened for them unaccountably, mysteriously, as by the touch of an invisible hand.

It was a stupendous task which he laid on His disciples in the missionary commandment with which the promise of His presence was coupled. The commission and the promise were well joined together. For an enterprise so measureless in its scope, and in the time through which it would have to be sustained—an enterprise wide as humanity and unending as the generations of men, that sought its conquests in the spiritual life of the world, and has to be renewed with a fresh zeal in every new age, there was needed the abiding inspiration, direction, and energy of its divine originator. So Christ gave this promise before His departure. So far from leaving His followers He would be nearer them and more with them than before. And it is only because He has kept His promise that the Kingdom which He inaugurated has endured and retained an inexhaustible newness of life.

The confidence which Christ had in Himself and in His destiny is the most wonderful thing in history. To feel this we have but to put ourselves in the place of His contemporaries. We are, let us say, His neighbours in the little town of Galilee, in which He was brought up. On its streets we meet a young man as he goes to and from his day's work, with his tools slung over his shoulder, or as he bends over the bench in his workshop. On whom are we looking? On one whose name will spread through all the world and through all time. His memory will become men's most sacred possession, his words their most precious treasure. He will wield a power in comparison of which that of

the mightiest monarch will be insignificant. The kings of the earth will seek for their investiture the sanction of his name, the countenance of his servants, the benediction of his spirit. Nations and peoples will be stable in the measure in which they own his authority, and are assimilated to his spirit. He will create the greatest personalities of the future, to whom it will be an immeasurable honour that he employs them in his service. From him human genius in all its kinds will derive its richest inspirations, and its noblest employment. His power will penetrate where no mortal authority can reach; he will reign in the dispositions and thoughts of the heart. He will be a new conscience to humanity. Whenever he finds a place at all it will come to be the highest place. He will be more to those who receive him than father or mother or brother or sister. He will be the only one of whom mothers will be glad that their children love him more than they love themselves. He will make immortal the name of every one who has appeared in his company; he will hallow for ever in the eyes of men whatever he has touched. Labour will be sweeter to men because he has laboured. The valley of death will be less lonely and the star of hope will shine upon it because he has passed through it. How incredible! How impossible! But it is what has happened. All this consciousness of His destiny Jesus carried in His own heart. He knew that His name would be above every name, and that He had inaugurated a divine movement in the world—a movement so in accord with the Eternal Mind that all after-history would but be the record of its struggles and of its ultimate and universal triumph.

In the Study.

Virgíñibus Puerisque.

I.

September

THE REAPERS.

'One soweth and another reapeth.'—Jn 4³⁷.

JESUS loved the country. The Gospels are full of pictures from Nature; the bright coloured field flowers, the green grass, the singing birds, the rustling corn, and the reapers.

They all spoke to Him; and in His parables He caught up what they said, and taught men how God, even when His workings were difficult to understand, was caring for them all the time. Most of you know something of the harvest fields. You feel that harvest is a very happy time. Its stripped garden trees mean barrelled apples. There is stubble in the field, but soon there will be a dusty miller making meal for the porridge. Some of you may even have played among the stacks; then you wished that sunny harvest days would

go on for a long time. But they never do. Fine weather makes a short harvest.

The New Testament is such a well-known book to most of you that I believe you lose interest in Christ's sayings. They fall on your ear like the striking of the clock you have at home. You never hear them.

And yet Christ was your Friend. He was always full of sympathy with children both in their joys and in their sorrows. And He thought a great deal about the sorrows that come into the lives of grown-up people. We know some of them. When they are very sad we call them tragedies. Not so very long ago, I heard of a young minister laying out his garden, putting down his seeds, pruning his gooseberry bushes. He was not well at the time, and members of his congregation who loved him, speaking to one another, said sorrowfully: 'He may live to see the early flowers, but he will never see his fruit ripen.' They were right; other people did gather the gooseberries.

This sort of tragedy was in Christ's mind as He watched the Samaritans streaming through the green cornfields to hear Him preach. He may have thought of John the Baptist, who had sown, and whose harvest He was reaping. Or His thoughts may have been of the harvest His disciples would reap when He Himself had left them.

Jesus quoted an ancient saying to His disciples: 'One soweth and another reapeth.' Coming from His lips as it did, after He had spoken other wise and beautiful words, it was more forceful than ever. And it never came with such a meaning as now. The life that is opening for you will be one of reaping. The sowers have given their lives, that life for you in this world may be according to the laws of the Kingdom of Heaven. Our young men—your brothers—knew the 'Sermon on the Mount.' It had become part of their natures. They were ready to die rather than that its words should be disregarded. 'One soweth and another reapeth.' They rejoiced that it should be so. The story of the sowing has filled our hearts with wonder. One would need to have the power of a prophet to be able to preach about it to you children.

From the innumerable grave
There will spring a world new-born,
With the austerest eyes and brave
And its clear gaze towards the morn.

He who gave His Son to die
For man's purchase, gives once more
These, His beloved sons, to buy
Him a world worth dying for.¹

—'A world worth dying for.'

That world is, in a manner, to be in your keeping.

A mother had a very clever, good son, who died. He was fond of flowers, and had potted some fine calceolarias in the early spring. At the time of his death they were gorgeous with beautiful blossoms. The mother took some of them to a friend, and said, 'I would just like you to take care of my boy's plants. They are dear to me because he potted them.'

Boys and girls, can you be trusted to try to make this world better? It was Jesus who uttered the text: 'One soweth and another reapeth.' Surely to-day we need to be in earnest over life. Jesus left His message to the care of twelve plain men. He left it to the care of the common people. To-day, He leaves the reaping of what your brothers have sown to you boys and girls. You will not fail in doing your share. Will you ask God's help to make you worthy of their sacrifice? Think of it when you see the reapers in the harvest fields.

II.

'The Greatness of Gentleness.'

'Thy gentleness hath made me great.'—2 S 22³⁶.

Don't you think this is rather a queer text? You would not have been surprised if David, who sang this song, had said, 'Thy strength hath made me great,' or, 'Thy power hath made me great'; but when he says, 'Thy gentleness hath made me great,' you think he must somehow have got hold of things by the wrong end.

Well, if you look at the first verse of this chapter you will see that David sang this psalm, 'in the day that the Lord delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies, and out of the hand of Saul.' He was looking back on the difficult and dangerous times through which he had come, and he saw that it was God's care for him, the kind and loving way He had led him, that had made him the great man he was. Perhaps when he reached this verse in his song, David remembered the time when he had been a shepherd boy. Perhaps he was thinking of some little tired lamb that he had carried

¹ K. Tynan, *Flower of Youth*, 50.

over the rough mountain-path, and he thought, 'That is just the way God stooped down to me in my need and lifted me up, and made me great and strong by His gentleness.'

Now it is a little difficult for us to understand how great a power gentleness is, so I want you to think about it for a little while to-day. And we are going first to Mother Nature to see what she has to say about it. What do you think is the most powerful thing in Nature? Perhaps some of you will say an earthquake. An earthquake is certainly a very powerful thing, but what does it do? It makes great rents in the earth's surface, it knocks down houses and destroys life. But can it build up the houses it has knocked down, can it give back the life it has destroyed? Not once. Then lightning seems a very powerful thing, and so it is. But what does it do? It blasts great trees, but it cannot give them life. And a hurricane is a very strong thing. It tears up plants by the root, it knocks down trees, and flies off with our slates and our chimney-pots, but it cannot make one tiny wild flower grow.

Now, do you think it is greater to make things or to destroy them? Surely it is greater to make them. It is easy to tear a book into shreds, but it is not so easy to write another. We could all destroy a toy or a doll, but how many of us could make one? And what is it that makes the flowers grow? The soft, warm rays of the sun, the gentle rain, the silent help of the soil underground. I think it is because gentle things don't make a noise that we forget how great they are. Few things are greater or quieter than the growing of flowers, and of boys and girls, the ripening of corn, or the coming of the dawn.

And just as gentleness is the greatest power in Nature, I think it is the greatest power in people too. If a friend flies into a rage with you, you will accomplish more by keeping calm and giving a gentle answer than by flying into a rage too.

Once upon a time a man arrived in a town with a monkey and a barrel-organ. The monkey wore a little red coat and a little red cap. He sat on the organ while the man played a tune, and afterwards he performed some tricks. One day a little dog came rushing out of one of the houses, and flew at the monkey, barking and making a terrible noise. The monkey waited till the dog came quite near, and then he took off his little red cap and made the dog a very polite bow. You should have

seen that dog. He was so astonished and so ashamed that he just dropped his tail and sneaked off into the house, without uttering another bark.

You will find that people will do much more for you if you are polite and gentle than if you are rough and rude. 'Please' and 'thank you' will always accomplish more than grabbing. Don't imagine that gentleness is a sign of 'softness.' It is a sign of strength. We can all be rough and cruel if we like, but it takes a strong brave man to control a temper, and be kind to little helpless things.

There is a story told of General Lee who was the leading general on the Southern side in the American Civil War. One morning he was standing with some officers under a tree on a battlefield. A shell burst near them, and the General said he thought they had better retire as the enemy had evidently got their range. Nobody moved till the chief should move, and the next shell crashed into the top of the tree. Then the officers took their leader's advice and began to retreat; but when they looked round the General was still under the tree. The shell had knocked down a bird's nest and he had stopped to pick it up and put it carefully on one of the lower branches. Although he was a great general he was not ashamed to take care of a little helpless bird.

And now we come back to the place where we began. It is God's gentleness, not the thought of His majesty or power, that makes us great. It is His love that draws us. There is a legend of a knight who did not believe in God and who was always laughing and sneering at those who did believe, and boasting of his unbelief. One day in a bragging mood he threw down his gauntlet, as knights used to do when they challenged each other to fight, and he said, 'If there be a God, I challenge Him to come down and meet me in mortal combat.' And while the people waited, trembling, expecting to see a lightning-flash strike the bold, proud knight to the ground, there came down from heaven a scroll of parchment on which were written these words, 'God is love.' That message broke down all the knight's pride and unbelief, and he was ever after a humble and loving servant of God.

God knows how foolish we are, and how far we can wander, and how much we can hurt ourselves, and He just wants to put His arms round us and wrap us in His love, safe from all harm. He

stoops down and takes us—poor, silly children, and He lifts us up and makes heroes of us—strong and wise, and tender. His gentleness makes us great.

III.

An Aerial Attack.

Who was it that said he preferred the Old Testament to the New, because there was so much in it of wars and battles? It is not in encouragement of so depraved a taste that Lettice Bell writes a whole book about *Bible Battles* (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net). It is to draw us all to the study of the Bible by showing how interesting it makes everything that it touches. We shall take the liberty of quoting the account of an Aerial Attack, as Lettice Bell rewrites it.

'Had Gibeon been only a village, the fact of Joshua having made peace with its inhabitants would have troubled nobody. But being a great city, as one of the royal cities, the kings of Canaan were greatly upset.

'Adoni-zedec King of Jerusalem was absolutely furious. What was the use of the agreement by which the kings had leagued themselves together to crush Joshua, if the Gibeonites were allowed to treat it as a mere scrap of paper? In a rage, the indignant king sent off to four kings of the Amorites, and this was the urgent message his servants delivered:

"Come up . . . and help me . . . smite Gibeon: for it hath made peace with Joshua."

'The four kings lost no time in bringing all their hosts together, and they, with Adoni-zedec, set out full of confidence to punish the faithless Gibeonites.

'You can just imagine the consternation that there was in Gibeon when the five kings were seen advancing and preparing to make war against it. The very voices that had once urged the pretenders to dress up and take Joshua in, were no doubt the very loudest to wail: "I told you so. Why ever did we make peace with Joshua, we shall all be killed! Five kings, did you say? Whatever shall we do?" This we feel sure was the way the people lamented over their terrible plight.

'Fortunately, amongst that weeping, chattering crowd were the men who had so successfully pretended to have come from a very far country. They had actually seen Joshua, had actually heard his promises. "Never fear, Joshua will help us,"

they said confidently. "Joshua will come . . . to us . . . and save us."

"Send for him," cried the frantic inhabitants, and at once a message every bit as urgent as Adoni-zedec's went flying over the twenty miles that stretched between Gibeon and Gilgal.

'And did Joshua listen to the request of these men who had so shamefully deceived him? Did he? - What a foolish question! Why, had he not pledged his word to let them live? Of course he had, and all his power and all his help were at their disposal in their hour of need.

'This time, however, Joshua did not omit to ask counsel from his Divine Captain, and he was able to go to the help of the threatened town, with a sure and certain promise of victory. "Fear them not," said the Lord, "for I have delivered them into thine hand." How? Joshua did not ask, because it did not matter how. He lost no time in mobilising his men, and in the night he marched quickly towards Gibeon.

'Before he arrived there, the five kings had each brought up their armies, and were already encamped around its walls. They were not worrying about Joshua in the very least. If they gave him a thought, it was only to picture him resting quietly at Gilgal, miles and miles away. So the five kings lay them down to sleep, quite comfortably, never suspecting that the armies of Israel were coming nearer every moment through the darkness.

'We do not think that the Gibeonites within the besieged city slept much that night, with five great armies ready to attack them at any moment, and no help in sight. Supposing Joshua did not come? Even supposing he did, would he ever be able to conquer five kings?

'Then as the Gibeonites trembled and wondered in the dark, a terrific noise startled them to their feet.

'Trumpets and shouts, the clash of arms and cries of terror rent the air as Joshua suddenly rushed his forces upon the formidable camp of the sleeping Canaanites.

'With the dawn, the anxious Gibeonites would be able to see the cause of the uproar. While safely within their own walls, they gazed on the battlefield strewn with their dead enemies, and watched those that had escaped the general massacre flying for dear life along the Beth-horon road. Then they knew, from the eldest to the youngest, that Joshua did not consider a treaty just a scrap of paper, to be torn up if convenient.

'Can't you imagine how the Gibeonite children would ask all about Joshua, and why he had come to save them? How they must have opened their eyes in amazement when their mothers reminded them of the dressing up in the old garments, and told them that Joshua was the very man their fathers had taken in! "Did he help us after that?" said the children. "After that," said the mothers softly.

'And as we think of the meaning of Joshua's name and the keeping of Joshua's pledge, he fades away from our minds, and the Saviour of whom Joshua was but a shadowy picture stands before us. His Hands are outstretched to help and save sinners as unworthy and despicable as the pretenders of Gibeon. "Come unto Me," He is saying to us, "and I will in no wise cast you out."

'Yes; after the way we have behaved; after all the times we have run away from Him, He still stands and says: "I will save you: come unto Me."

'Now we must get back to the battle. Along the Beth-horon road the Israelites chased the runaway Canaanites, and as they ran, heavy black clouds gathered ominously in the sky. A long narrow pass, between the hills, lay in front of the fugitives. We do not think they were best pleased to be obliged to go through it, with the storm in their faces and their foes at their backs.

'Such a storm as it was too! A regular deluge storm, for God was fighting for Israel and for Gibeon with the mighty forces that lie within the hollow of His Hand. Not from aeroplane or Zeppelin did bombs descend upon the panic-stricken Canaanites, yet bombs as deadly as any made in Germany fell down upon them from God's Aerial Fleet of cloudy chariots. Bombs not made with steel and gunpowder, the work of men's hands, but stones of solid ice fashioned by unfathomable skill in the arsenals of heaven. So hard and so great were the weapons of destruction, that more died from the hailstones than were killed by the sword. Modern air-craft can boast no such success.

'And of all the Bible battle stories this one must be specially meant to give us courage when we feel like shivering at the thought of German Zeppelins. God still holds the wind and the ice in His almighty Hand, and those are forces He can use at any moment on behalf of those who trust in Him.'

Point and Illustration.

A South American Rescue.

The 'Other Lands' series of Messrs. Oliphant is the best value for the money in children's books that we know. The new volume, *Children of South America*, by Katherine A. Hodge (1s. 6d. net), contains one hundred and twenty-eight beautifully printed pages and eight richly coloured full-page illustrations. And it is a book for children out and out, as the page we shall quote by way of example will show. It is full of incident, and every incident is told in language that is simple and yet imaginative. This is the story of the rescue of a baby.

'The mother of a dear little Indian girl became very ill one day. The husband, who really loved his wife, did all he could to make her well, but in spite of this she gradually grew worse instead of better. When he saw that she could not possibly live, and that all hope was gone he left her alone.

'There she lay, outside the hut, with a reed matting over her face, her life fast ebbing away. It was about an hour before sunset. The Indians were getting restless, when the missionary walked into their midst. Seeing the form on the ground, he stooped down, taking the matting from the Indian woman's face.

'She whispered: "Water." Reluctantly it was brought by the Indian husband, but a few minutes later she became quite unconscious. The eyes of the Indians were anxiously looking, not towards the dying woman, but toward the sinking sun, for she must be buried before sunset. They would all have to pack up and hurry away to a new camping-place, where the woman's spirit could not follow.

'Impatiently they stepped forward, but were waved back by the missionary. Her grave was ready, everything was prepared for the funeral rites.

"The spirit has not left her yet," he said; "do not touch her."

"But we must hasten, or darkness will be upon us before we leave," replied the husband; "we cannot break our custom."

'The missionary held them off as long as he could, till finally they bore her away. Stepping into their hut, he heard a faint noise, and seeing a small, dark object on the floor, he stooped down and tenderly lifted up the now motherless baby girl. What a dear, wee, brown living thing she was!

'Turning round he saw her father, who held out his arms saying that he had come to take her away to be buried with her mother. The missionary gazed at him with horror in his eyes.

"Oh, but you are not going to kill her, surely?" said he, hugging baby closer.

"Of course not," said the father; "we are going to put her in the ground alive. It is our custom!"

'He did not think about the cruelty of such a proceeding. It was part of their religion, and, therefore, must be carried out. So there was a tussle between the father and the missionary for the Chaco baby's life, and I am glad to say the missionary won, but the Indians did not like it at all.

'The first thing to be considered was what to give baby to eat, and the second problem how to get her to the mission-station a hundred miles away. Finding that no Indian woman would help him in the matter of nursing and feeding her, he saw that he would have to be both nurse and mother to her himself.'

How he nursed the baby is full of fun, but you must go to the book for it.

The Teeth.

After Robinson came Thomson, after Thomson came Neil—that is the succession of the men who have done most to illustrate the Book by the Land. Mr. James Neil's last volume (he died before it was quite through the press) is *Palestine Life* (Simpkin), an octavo of about four hundred pages, filled to the brim with the things that illuminate the words of Scripture. Mr. Neil had a genius for bringing custom and text together. Out of this last book of his it would be easy to gather illustrations enough to fill a notebook. And that is the more surprising when we remember that so many books with so much in them have gone before. Here is something about teeth, which might become the basis of an address to children.

'The teeth of the mass of the people are very beautiful and long preserved, and toothache is not much met with, except in the case of the rich in towns. They never use a tooth-brush; but, notwithstanding this, their teeth are of the whitest, with the enamel so well preserved that they shine like those of wild animals of the feline order. This regular, glistening, pure white, elegant appearance

of the teeth is doubtless brought about largely by their exceedingly simple, healthy diet, and vigorous open-air life. The *fellahheen* are practically vegetarians, and owe much of the perfection of their teeth and gums to their only on rare occasions eating meat, and also to the very little sugar they take, and that mostly in the wholesome and easily digested form of grape sugar.

'But they owe still more to their careful practice of thoroughly washing and cleaning their mouths immediately after each meal, using for this purpose water, and sometimes soap and water. In wealthy houses, after the guests have finished the repast, slaves come round with a cup of water, a bowl, and napkins used for this purpose. This practice of the ablution of the gums and mouth immediately after taking food is of the highest importance to health in general, as well as to the preservation of the beauty of the teeth.

'Well-preserved teeth were always reckoned a great mark of beauty and health, and of the bride we read in the Bridal Song:

"Thy teeth are like a row of the shorn ones,
That have come up from the washing;
For all of them are forming twins,
And a bereaved one is not among them."

Or, as it is again:

"Thy teeth are like a row of the lambs,
That have come up from the washing," etc.,

that is, they are spotlessly white, clean, and regular. It is interesting to note, in this connexion, the fine figure of periphrasis, or circumlocution, by which the Lord speaks of hunger in the judgment denounced on the kingdom of Israel for their idolatry at Bethel and Gilgal:

"I have given you cleanness of teeth,
In all your cities;
And lack of bread,
In all your places."

This word *makoam* being the technical name of the "place" or "high place," "the idolatrous mountain shrine," we have here in the last line an allusive reference to the corrupt worship, the sin of idolatry, which had brought upon them the punishment of famine.

'It is striking to notice in this connexion that the pure, glistening white, snow-covered summit in which Anti-Lebanon ends at the south, a pointed

peak, was called by the Amorites, *Seneer*, probably for Sheneer, from *shain*, "a tooth." This summit is 9,150 feet above sea-level. It is one of the most striking features of the land, and is to be seen from afar, standing out, a white cone, against the blue sky. I have seen it most distinctly from Joppa, a distance of some 120 miles! In Canticles the bridegroom cries to the bride:

"Come with me from Lebanon, [my] spouse,
with me from Lebanon,
Look from the top of Amann, from the top
of Seneer and Hermon."

Hermon appears to be the name of the mountain, and Sheneer, which occurs under the form of Seneer, the tooth-like peak at its summit.

Men of the Knotted Heart.

The Rev. Thomas Cassels, M.A., Junior Minister of Wellpark United Free Church, Greenock, has done one of the most difficult things that any man could be set to do, and he has done it well. He has written the biography of two men, both of peculiar endowment and without external incident. He has written their lives together as if it were one life—for they were of closest friendship. He has done this so well that the men live before our eyes, separately and together, and will live now, as long as biographies are read. For he has thrown himself into the book with an abandon of admiration which carries one's whole soul into sympathy. The title of the book is *Men of the Knotted Heart* (Greenock: McKelvie; 3s. 6d. net).

We had marked good anecdotes and incidents for quotation, but still better will be the quotation of a section on a single topic. The men are the Rev. Alexander Duncan Grant of the United Free Church and the Rev. John Paterson Struthers of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, both settled for many years in Greenock, and both associated in our mind with that wonderful little monthly magazine *The Morning Watch*, although Mr. Struthers was really the editor of it.

This is the quotation:

'Of Struther's preaching the doctrinal basis was the thought of the Love of God. To him the world was full of kindnesses, great and small, which God was busy doing. The tender mercy of the Lord was over all His works. Perhaps there is no more valuable asset in any town than a man who

believes invincibly in the love of God. We all believe, but how many believe *invincibly*? How many times do we hesitate in the face of some most cruel sorrow, and wonder how God's love could ever say "Amen" to that! We faint by the way. We may even admit hell and God's mercy there, but we hesitate, sometimes, in face of the little pitiable things, which so rend the heart and break open the fountains of our tears.

'Just such a story is that which Lord Lytton tells of the old Frenchman, who made his living in Versailles by exhibiting some white mice, most intelligent little creatures, whom he had trained to climb poles, leap through paper hoops, and perform other antics. Late one night, when he was crossing the Boulevard des Italiens with his little performers, who had gone to bed snug in their box under his arm, he was nearly run over by a steam-roller, and, in the effort to save himself, dropped his box, which was crushed beneath the iron monster. Three hours later, one who had witnessed the tragedy passed the spot again and found the poor old man still there, leaning against a lamp-post and weeping bitterly for his white mice. Here is a story typical of the miseries that are daily recurring round us, and there is in it a certain needlessness, a wanton heartlessness, which sets one wondering and perhaps doubting. Now in *The Morning Watch* Struthers tells the story, and there is a little pathetic picture of the Frenchman; and when he has told the story he makes this comment:

"One wonders why God did this thing, and yet one may be sure that, if we knew everything, we should see that God did it all in love, love to the old man and love to the little mice too. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without our Father. Not one of them is ever forgotten before Him. He permitted them, as the Psalmist tells us, to find a house where they might lay their young, 'even Thine altars, O Lord of Hosts, my King and my God.' But mice have come closer to Him still. For do we not read in the Book of Samuel how the mice of gold were put in a little coffer, and the coffer was laid beside the very Ark of the Covenant, close by the Mercy-seat and the Cherubim?"

'Here, I take it, is a comment which only a man with an invincible faith in the love of God could write; and to the afflicted, the wounded in life's

affray, such a man was the very Presence of God, and his words as a banner and a sword.

'This invincible faith in God's love was part of his heritage from his mother. I have told of her last prayer: here is another story of her dying time. She told her son that she had remembered with great pity the souls that are outcast for ever. "But the All-Merciful may save them yet," she said. "It repented Him once, it may repent Him again." The text she alluded to (Gn 6⁶) has been a stumbling-stone to many, but what a strong faith it was which struck from it a spark of eternal hope!

'Grant had much the more philosophic mind. He met such an incident as that of the old Frenchman, not by a simple child-like statement of his continued and triumphant belief in God's love, but by seeking some explanation along lines I have already indicated—the existence of a Fate in the world, created, but not inevitably controlled, by God. He used to point out that there was a heartlessness in things. One could see it in Nature, he said. And he would quote:

"Ye bank and braes o' bonnie Doon,
How *can* ye bloom sae fresh and fair?"

as an illustration of the careless indifference of the most beautiful things to sorrow and heartbreaking. When he was challenged to square such ideas with the cardinal thought of the love of God, he pointed out that our games consist in overcoming difficulties which we ourselves have made. In golf we could walk up to the hole and drop the ball in with our hand—as Struthers did on one occasion at Bo'ness—but, instead, we multiply the difficulties—bunkers and rules—and the game consists in getting the ball into the hole in spite of these. Even so, he would say, God has made rules for Himself with regard to us. He has created Fate; He has made rules, which we call natural laws, and which by their action break an old Frenchman's heart or somebody else's, every day, every hour. And we have to play the game also—with these rules. We have to accept the killing of the white mice, and loved ones ten times dearer; and the game is to keep loving God, and knowing that He loves us, in spite of all.'

Retardation of the Beatific Vision.

BY THE REV. H. B. WORKMAN, D.D., D.LIT., PRINCIPAL OF THE WESLEYAN TRAINING COLLEGE, WESTMINSTER.

THIS heresy, if indeed it be a heresy, is chiefly of importance for its relation to the question of Papal Infallibility. On November 1st, 1331, Pope John XXII. at Avignon preached a sermon for All Saints' Day on the doctrine of the Intermediate State. He maintained that the saints who have no need of purgatory must await like ordinary mortals for the Beatific Vision until after the Resurrection and the Judgment; for, if otherwise, the Resurrection, by adding nothing, would condemn itself as superfluous: 'The soul separated from the body has not that Vision of God, nor can it have before the Resurrection.'

John was little prepared for the outburst that followed. On December 15th he found it advisable to preach a second sermon to explain the first. In this sermon, John concludes with the words: 'I say with Augustine that if I err let him who knows better correct me. I cannot hold otherwise unless the determination of the Church or the authority

of Sacred Scriptures be shown to be contrary.' In a third sermon (Jan. 5, 1332), 'in the presence of cardinals, prelates, and doctors,' the pope, aroused to his need of the defensive, showed that his opinions were not new. He referred especially to his contention that if the blessed do not enter at once into heaven neither do the wicked enter into hell until after the Judgment. In a fourth sermon (Feb. 2, 1332) John acknowledged that there were many murmurs against his opinion, but added, 'I can do no otherwise.' John did not see the far-reaching consequences of his doctrine. In reality he swept away popular medieval worship, for if the saints are not in heaven prayers for their help become vain. Moreover, did this doctrine apply to the Virgin Mary, for no pope had yet ratified the favourite dogma of the Paris University, the Immaculate Conception?

On the news of the pope's sermons being brought to Paris riots broke out, and in the autumn an

English Dominican, Thomas Walleys or Walsh, preached against them in a sermon still preserved at Cambridge. He was arrested by the Franciscan inquisitor, cast into prison (Jan. 9, 1333), and brought to Avignon. In spite of the efforts to release him of the French king, Philip, Walsh lingered on in prison, occupying his leisure in writing a larger reply to John, called *de Instantibus et Momentis*, now also at Cambridge. As Paris was still seething with excitement, the pope caused his sermons to be translated into French and dedicated to Queen Joanna. He also obtained a decision condemning Walsh from eighteen doctors, five of whom were English, among them John Luttrell, late chancellor of Oxford, a letter of whose on the subject of the Beatific Vision is at Cambridge. Philip replied by summoning twenty-nine doctors of Paris to Vincennes (Dec. 19, 1333) under the chairmanship of the famous Nicholas de Lyra.

They had no option but to gratify the king by a verbal condemnation of the pope's heresies. 'The souls,' they said, 'which have no need of purgatory, or which have already finished their purgation, pass at once to the Vision, naked, clear, beatific, immediate, and intuitive, of the Blessed Trinity, a vision which the Apostle calls Face to Face.' This, they held, was a necessary consequence of the Descent of Christ into Hades and His Harrowing of Hell. Not content with this verbal condemnation, Philip forced them to reduce it to writing, and send it to John (Jan. 2, 1334).

But hearing of the king's intention, John had held a Consistory at Avignon to discuss the matter (Dec. 28, 1333-Jan. 2, 1334). All the cardinals except two and a great number of prelates and doctors were present. 'No one here to-day,' said the pope, 'would give as much as I would for the affirmative to be proved, for then I myself, my parents and friends, would come more quickly to the Beatific Vision.' 'But if,' continued the pope, the Consistory should decide otherwise, 'we protest that if perchance in the sermons referred to some things be met with at all contrary to Scripture and the orthodox faith . . . we expressly revoke the same, for it is not our intention to stick to them or defend them either now or hereafter' (*Chartul. Univ. Paris*, ii. 435). After John's speech five days were spent in reading authorities for and against. Each member in turn was then forced under pain of excommunication to declare 'what seemed to him to be the truth according to

the testimony of Scripture.' The result is not known, but would seem to have been neither unanimous nor satisfactory. A certain Dominican present, Friar Armandus by name, who had already compiled a defence of Walsh (according to a letter of his still preserved together with his Defence (*Responsiones*) at Cambridge), summed up decisively against the pope and called his theory 'a new and strange idea.' Later in the year a second attempt was made by John to settle the matter, but without success.

On December 2nd, 1334, John was seized with a fatal flux. His kinsmen, it is said, surrounded his bed and urged the pope to save his soul by a complete retraction. The old man (he was over ninety) at last yielded. According to his successor, Benedict XII., the value of whose evidence is discounted by his opposition to John's ideas, the pope summoned the cardinals, 'together with some prelates and public notaries.' John then 'caused a letter to be read, engrossed under his name,' several copies of which, spurious or genuine, are still preserved. In this letter John declared that if 'he had said anything whether in sermon, dogma, or teaching contrary to the determination of the Church, Sacred Scripture, and good customs, we wish them to be regarded as if they were not said.' The letter goes on to affirm that John now 'confesses and believes that purified souls though separate from their bodies are already in heaven and see God face to face.' Thus the pope 'made confession, revocation, and submission concerning the matters discussed in the letter.' A few hours later John lay dead (Dec. 4, 1334).

Whether the letter be true or false, the next day the Curia published to the world John's letter and the story of his deathbed repentance (Dec. 5, 1334). From the first it was received with incredulity and contempt. Several of the chroniclers of the day openly contended that the letter was a forgery, and the repentance a myth. John's opponent, the famous English Franciscan, William of Ockham, poured ridicule on the whole story. John, he said, had died a heretic. Whether the letter is genuine it is now impossible to decide, but of the convenience for the Papacy of the story of this deathbed repentance there can be no doubt. Within a year of John's death his successor, Benedict XII., settled the matter with the help of a committee of Paris theologians, most of them young men (Jan. 29, 1336). Henceforth in the Roman Church, by the constitution *Benedictus Deus*, it was

held to be heresy to agree with the views of Pope John xxii.

Of the whole transaction, John's sermons included, there is now only one existing MS. (Camb. Univ. Library, MS. I. i. 3. 10), which has never yet been published, and scarcely noticed by theologians or historians. Fragments of John's third sermon, not in the Camb. MS., are in the Vatican, which also contains a number of treatises on the subject

collected by a certain Franciscan friar called Nicholas (*Chartul. Paris*, ii. 414). A sister MS. which once existed in Paris was destroyed by some ultramontane in the 17th century. Valuable notes on the whole matter, by the Abbé Denifle, will be found in the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, ii. 414 ff., as also in *Archiv für Literatur- u. Kirchengesch.*, vol. vi. See also an article by the present writer in *London Quarterly Review*, 1903, and H. Lea, *History of Inquisition*, iii. 591 ff.

Contributions and Comments.

Numbers xxii. 21-31.

S. REINACH, in his book *Orpheus* (Engl. tr. 1909), remarks that one of the most curious episodes in the Book of Numbers 'is that of Balaam the prophet, whose ass seems to have been an echo of the worship of the ass, considered as an oracular animal.' He compares the story (Nu 22²¹⁻³¹) with those animal fables which were widely prevalent in ancient times, and thinks that 'the primitive stories which were combined and revised to form the Bible must have bristled (!) with tales of animals.' Yet he is obliged to admit that in the Bible, as it has come down to us, animals are represented very rarely as speaking. There are only two instances: that of the serpent in Genesis, and that of Balaam's ass in Numbers. With the former I am not concerned at present.

According to the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (s.v. 'Balaam'), the story in Numbers, 'though welded with some psychological skill into the surrounding narrative, is a decoration derived from folklore.' So also, according to G. B. Gray (*Numbers in 'Inter. Crit. Com.'*), who compares the talking cow in the Egyptian *Tale of the Two Brothers*, 'a piece of folklore is here utilised for the purposes of the story.' But in the light of the new study of psychic phenomena, it seems to the present writer that the explanation of some of the strange episodes in the Old Testament as pure fables or myths requires to be modified. In the present instance, even if we grant that the vision-interpretation of Maimonides is unsatisfactory, we are not driven to invoke the aid of the sacred ass or to compare such fantastic fables of talking animals as we find in many Oriental writings (cp. the *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, Syriac and English, ed. by W. Wright, 1871).

The story admits of a psychological explanation. We are told elsewhere in the Old Testament that the prophets and others rode on asses. Here the animal is introduced quite naturally. The only remarkable incident is that speech is ascribed to it. Now, in the experience of recent ages animals of course do not speak. But in the experience of mankind in all ages voices have been heard which

have seemed to come from anywhere or nowhere (cp. T. J. Hudson, *The Law of Psychic Phenomena*, 1907, pp. 243-250); and in ancient times, when men had not learned to distinguish between subjective and objective phenomena, it is not surprising to find these voices ascribed sometimes to extraordinary causes. D. B. Macdonald, in speaking of the Arab poet (*The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*, 1909), with whom he compares some of the Hebrew prophets, says truly that 'often, as to Socrates, his own decision must have come as with a voice from without, and it would take little to add a visible form.' In the case of Balaam, a visible form was present in the animal he rode. What could be more natural than to ascribe to this a voice which Balaam may have heard distinctly? Balaam was requested by Balak, king of Moab, to go and curse the Israelites, that is to say, to bring them under the baneful influence of a powerful spell. At first he refused to do so. When at length he did consent to go, it was with great reluctance and hesitation. He went in a meditative mood and in an uneasy state of mind. It is well known that the sympathy between a rider and his steed is often such that by a kind of telepathy the animal is influenced by the mental state of the rider. Balaam's uncertainty communicated itself to the animal, which several times tried to turn back. The prophet beat the animal, and at length heard a voice rebuking him. This voice Balaam himself, or his reporter, ascribed to the animal. Whether what Balaam heard has been rightly recorded is another question. But the tradition that the animal had been known to speak is not difficult to understand. It is possible, therefore, that this story, with others which have seemed equally fantastic, is a faithful record of a psychical experience which was real enough but was misunderstood.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

Manchester.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.